STUDIES IN GALILEAN ARAMAIC

E. Y. KUTSCHER

BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY • RAMAT-GAN

Translated from the Hebrew Original
and Annotated with Additional Notes
from the Author's Handcopy

by

MICHAEL SOKOLOFF

©

COPYRIGHT 1976. BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY

PRINTED IN ISRAEL

AT AHVA PRESS, JERUSALEM

Trans
List o

1. C
A
I

2. M
C
A

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Translator's Preface VII
List of Abbreviations IX

1. Galilean Aramaic — The Problem 1
   A. Reliable Texts 3
   B. The Other Western Aramaic Dialects 4

2. Ms. Vat. Ebr. 30 (= Ms. V) of Bereshit Rabba Compared with Other Reliable Texts and the Other Dialects of Western Aramaic 11
   A. The Nature of Ms. V 11
   B. Grammatical Corruptions in Ms. L and in Other Manuscripts as opposed to Ms. V 13
   C. Ms. V — A Trustworthy Source for the Knowledge of Palestinian Aramaic 16
   Spelling and Pronunciation 16
   The Noun 20
   Numerals 26
   The Verb 29
   Pronouns 31
   Particles 31
   Miscellanea 32
   Vocabulary 33
   "*Kětīb* and *Qĕre*" 34
   Various Corrections 34
   Place Names 35
   Exegetical Remarks 36
   Postscript to Ms. V 38

3. Clarification of Grammatical Points in Galilean Aramaic 43
   A. The Ending *-ayīn* (*byt šryyn, šryy* "Beth Shearim," etc.) 43
   B. The Construction *mn* + the Participle 51

C. Word-Final $m > n$ 58
D. The Gutturals (Laryngeals and Pharyngeals) in Galilee 67
Previous Opinions on the Subject 67
Direct Evidence 68
The Linguistic Change $ḥ >$ ' in Palestine 70
Rabbinic Sources 72
Indications of the Weakening of the Gutturals in Jewish Sources 78
Place Names as Proof 84
Conclusions 89
Additional Evidence 92

Notes from the Author's Handcopy and Updating of the Bibliography 97

Indices
1. Aramaic and Hebrew Words 107
2. Place Names 109
3. Personal Names 110
4. Greek and Latin Words and Transcriptions 111
5. Arabic Words and Place Names 112
6. Grammatical Points 112
7. Languages and Linguistic Sources 113

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

Studies in Galilean Aramaic by the late Prof. E.Y. Kutscher (1909–1971) originally appeared in four installments in the Hebrew periodical *Tarbiz*[1], and then as a separate publication with indices, an English summary, and a table of contents[2].

The translation was begun in 1969, and the translator was able to consult with the author concerning several changes and improvements which were introduced into the English version with the author's concurrence. They are as follows:

1. All quotations from Ms.Vat.Ebr. 30 of Bereshit Rabba were rechecked from a photograph of the manuscript[3]. Furthermore, all quotations from Rabbinic and other primary sources as well as references to the secondary literature were rechecked.

2. In the original article direct quotations in German, French, and English were given in Hebrew translation. In the translation they have been quoted in the original languages.

3. In the original article many footnotes were added in proof and numbered a, b, c, etc. These, as well as many references and notes given in the body of the original text but which have now been relegated to the footnotes, have been renumbered consecutively. Therefore, the numbering of the footnotes in the translation does not correspond to that of the original.

4. Page references to Bereshit Rabba and other primary sources have been arranged in ascending order.

1 Vol. XXI (1950), pp. 192–205; XXII (1951), pp. 53–63; 185–192; XXIII (1952), pp. 36–60.

2 *Studies in Galilean Aramaic*, Jerusalem 1952. Because of the addition of a title page the pagination of the separate edition differs from that of the offprint by two pages. Thus, e.g., p. 5 in the offprint is p. 7 in the separate edition. See the author's note at the bottom of the table of contents.

3 The author employed a microfilm of the manuscript and worked under difficult conditions (see p. 12, n. 4).

5. In consultation with the author, several errors noted in the process of the translation have been eliminated.

6. Works frequently cited were given abbreviations (see "List of Abbreviations") and are cited by such throughout.

7. Hebrew words quoted in connection with points of Galilean Aramaic phonology are noted by the abbreviation (H).

8. Several books quoted by the author from manuscripts placed at his disposal have now been published[4] and page references have been given to them. References to books which have now appeared in new editions have been adopted, since these are generally more available to the reader[5].

In consultation with the author it was decided to present a translation and not a reworking of the original article, and this plan has been kept. The updating of the bibliography which the author had planned to do himself has been undertaken by the translator in the appendix[6] and has been limited to the most necessary items. I have especially tried to refer to articles which the author subsequently wrote, in which he enlarged and commented on matters of Galilean Aramaic.

I would like to thank Dr. R. Kutscher for placing his father's personal annotated copy of "Studies" at my disposal. Marginal notes and corrections found in it have been incorporated into the text where possible, and where not, have been placed in the appendix (marked E.Y.K.).

I would also like to thank Dr. M. Sharon who kindly checked the transliteration of the Arabic place names.

It is the translator's hope that the appearance in English of this important work by the dean of Jewish Aramaic studies will be especially welcome to Aramaic scholars who have not been able to read the original.

4 These are: M. Margulies, *Midrash Wayyikra Rabbah*, 1953–1960; U. Cassuto, *Codices Vaticanae Hebraici* 1–115, Rome 1956.

5 These are: P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*[2], Oxford 1959; B. Mazar, *Beth Shearim*[2], I, Jerusalem 1958; M. Avi-Yonah, *Historical Geography of Palestine*[2], Jerusalem 1962 (Hebrew).

6 The additional notes have been indicated in the text by letters.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAC: S. Krauss *et al.*, *Additamenta ad Librum Aruch Completum*, Vienna 1937.

AC: A. Kohut, *Aruch Completum*[2], 8 volumes, Vienna 1926.

AF: F. Rosenthal, *Die aramaistische Forschung seit Th. Nöldeke's Veröffentlichungen*, Leiden 1939.

AP: A.E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri from the Fifth Century B.C.*, Oxford 1923.

BA: Biblical Aramaic.

Bergsträsser, *Glossar*: G. Bergsträsser, *Glossar des neuaramäischen Dialekts von Ma'lūla*, Leipzig 1921.

B–L: H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Grammatik des biblisch-Aramäischen*, Halle 1927.

BR: J. Theodor and Ch. Albeck, *Bereschit Rabba mit kritischem Apparat und Kommentar*, Berlin 1912–1936.

Brockelmann, *LS*[2]: C. Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*[2], Halle 1928.

CG: P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, London 1947; second edition, Oxford 1959.

CIS: *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*.

CPA: Christian Palestinian Aramaic.

Dalman, *Grammatik*: G. Dalman, *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch*[2], Leipzig 1905.

EG: S. Klein, *Ereṣ ha-Galil* (The Land of Galilee), Jerusalem 1946.

Flora: I. Löw, *Die Flora der Juden*, I–IV, Vienna-Leipzig 1924–1934.

FPT: P. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens*, II, Stuttgart 1930, pp. 1–65: Fragmente des palästinischen Pentateuchtargums.

GA: Galilean Aramaic.

Gesenius-Buhl: W. Gesenius, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*, bearbeitet von F. Buhl, Leipzig 1921.

GHEY: M. Avi-Yonah, *Geografiya Hiṣṭorit šel Ereṣ Yisra'el* (A Historical Geography of Palestine[2]), Jerusalem 1962.

GPE: J. Cantineau, *Grammaire du palmyrénien épigraphique*, Cairo 1935.

GS: L. Ginzberg, *Geniza Studies in Memory of Doctor Solomon Schechter*, I, New York 1928.

GVG: C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, I, Berlin 1908.

H: Hebrew.

HUCA: *Hebrew Union College Annual*.

JPCI: S. Klein, *Jüdisches-palästinisches Corpus Inscriptionum*, Vienna 1928.

MdW: P. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens*, I, Stuttgart 1927; II, Stuttgart 1930.

MG: Th. Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, Halle 1875.

MGWJ: *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*.

MNM: J.N. Epstein, *Mavo lĕ-Nosaḥ ha-Mišna* (Introduction to the Text of the Mishnah), Jerusalem 1948.

MS: S. Klein, *Ma'amarim Šonim Laḥaqirat Erĕṣ Yisra'el* (Various Articles on the Study of Palestine), Vienna 1924.

SA: Samaritan Aramaic.

Schulthess, *Grammatik*: F. Schulthess, *Grammatik des christlich-palästinischen Aramäisch*, Tübingen 1924.

—, *LS*: *Lexicon Syropalaestinum*, Berlin 1903.

SL: A.E. Cowley, *The Samaritan Liturgy*, Oxford 1909.

SPI: F. Rosenthal, *Die Sprache der palmyrenischen Inschriften*, Leipzig 1936.

Spitaler, *Ma'lūla*: A. Spitaler, *Grammatik des neuaramäischen Dialekt von Ma'lūla*, Leipzig 1938.

SS: G. Dalman, *Sacred Sites and Ways* (trans. P. Leverthoff), London 1935.

SY: S. Klein, *Sefer ha-Yiššuv* (Book of the Settlement), I, Jerusalem 1939.

TA: Talmudic Aramaic (Aramaic of the Babylonian Talmud).

TB: Talmud Bavli.

TJ: Targum Jonathan.

TO: Targum Onkelos.

TY: Talmud Yerushalmi (Palestinian Talmud), *editio princeps*, Venice 1523.

YFE: J.N. Epstein, 'Additional Fragments of the Jerushalmi', *Tarbiz*, III (1932), pp. 15–26; 121–136; 237–248.

YFG: L. Ginzberg, *Yerushalmi Fragments from the Genizah*, New York 1909.

YFL: S. Loewinger, 'New Fragments from the Yerushalmi Pesahim ch. 5–7', *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume*, New York 1950, Hebrew Section, pp. 237–286.

ZDPV: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins*.

1. GALILEAN ARAMAIC — THE PROBLEM

For some time scholars dealing with Galilean Aramaic (viz. the language of the Aramaic portions of the Palestinian Talmud, of the Aggadic Midrashim, of Pseudo-Jonathan, etc.) have felt that the linguistic investigation of this dialect was insufficiently grounded[1]. It is therefore necessary to ascertain the present state of knowledge in this field and to sketch the outlines for future research in it.

It is my opinion that for several reasons the study of GA is in need of a complete revision.[a] True, there is Dalman's detailed grammar of GA[2]; however, it is clear to me that this book has several defects. If in spite of them this book still has value, nevertheless, its definite statements are doubtful, and it cannot serve at all as a reliable basis for the description and study of GA. The book lacks a syntax[b] and this *a priori* has a detrimental effect on its other sections. More serious was Dalman's methodological error of including material from too many different sources. The book is not only a grammar of GA, but also a grammar of TO and TJ to Prophets. It is now certain that the vocalization of these Targumim[c] is not Palestinian but Babylonian[3]. Thus, they cannot be used at all to illustrate a Galilean form. Moreover, it is also doubtful whether the consonantal forms are of Palestinian origin. In any event these texts were certainly edited in Babylonia[4]. For our purposes they cannot be used until they have undergone a minute linguistic investigation (cf. *infra* § 2).

It is, however, true that in each chapter Dalman treated Targumic Aramaic in separate paragraphs; however, their close proximity has in the past led both casual readers as well as serious scholars into mistakes

1 See, e.g. H.L. Ginsberg, *Tarbiz*, V (1934), p. 383, n. 14; S. Lieberman, *ibid.*, III (1932), p. 456, n. 3.

2 Dalman, *Grammatik*.

3 Rosenthal, *AF*, p. 130.

4 Kahle now claims that they were composed in Babylonia. See: Kahle, *CG*, p. 117. There is as yet no definite proof in this matter.

and will probably continue to do so in the future. Nevertheless, these are not the decisive faults, nor is the fact that Dalman occasionally misunderstood the text[5]. In spite of all its defects the book represented in its time an important step forward in this field. Dalman's achievement appears even greater when we consider the fact that it was probably not easy for him to understand the material completely. After all, no Jewish scholar had taken up the task before him.

The most vital reason for a complete revision lies in the texts which Dalman used. These texts, viz. the first editions of the Palestinian Talmud, the Aggadic Midrashim, etc., *are linguistically corrupt* to such an extent that *they cannot form the basis of a grammatical description of this dialect.* This fact becomes clear from a comparison with the new texts which were discovered after the publication of Dalman's book (see *infra*). This holds true not only as regards the printed editions (including the first editions), but also with regard to manuscripts — even some which were considered very reliable (e.g. British Museum Add. 27169 [Ms. L] which was employed as the basis of the critical edition of Bereshit Rabba).

In particular, manuscripts which were copied in Europe cannot be considered as primary reliable sources from a linguistic point of view. The reason for this is quite simple. There is, of course, no work which is free from copyist's errors. However, in this case there is an additional factor. In Europe the Babylonian Talmud was primarily studied. Therefore, to the extent that the copyists knew Aramaic they were familiar with *Babylonian Aramaic* which is an *Eastern* and not a Western Aramaic dialect. In addition to the language of the Babylonian Talmud, that of TO was also well known due to the custom of reciting the weekly Torah portion in Aramaic. As a result intentionally and unintentionally *the copyists tend to overlay both the Babylonian and TO dialects on the Galilean dialect.* (Occasionally, of course, Hebrew forms also crept in.) By examining the apparatus in the critical edition of Bereshit Rabba[6] one may observe this tendency on any page containing Aramaic passages. It is instructive, for example, to compare the readings of Ms. Vat. Ebr. 30 (Ms.V) and Ms. L with those of the *editio princeps* or even with those of other manuscripts. One can observe how GA, a Western Aramaic dialect, "develops" and turns into Babylonian Aramaic, an Eastern dialect.

A. Reliable Texts

In recent years much progress has been made by scholars in establishing the correct text of the Palestinian Talmud by use of the Leyden Ms.[a] (from which the *editio princeps* was printed in Venice), Ms. Vat. Ebr. 133 of the Order Zera'im and the Tractate Soṭah,[b] and quotations in early writers[7]. However, these manuscripts as well as the works of the early writers, are linguistically very corrupt and can never constitute a *reliable basis* for study. What is needed are reliable texts which are free (or nearly free) from the above-mentioned outside influences. Reliable texts of this type are available mostly as the result of the discovery of the Cairo Geniza. The main types of reliable texts are the following:

1) Fragments of the Palestinian Talmud — The majority of these have been collected by L. Ginzberg[8], and the rest by J.N. Epstein[9] and others[10]. The provenance of these texts is closer both in time and place to Palestine of the Amoraic period, and we may *a priori* assume that the scribes who copied them had a better knowledge of GA than the later European copyists. Thus they certainly did not *intentionally* "Babylonianize" the Galilean forms, and probably were less prone to unintentional corruptions than the European copyists. As will be shown, these texts have much fewer suspect Babylonian forms.

2) Fragments of the Palestinian Targum[d] — These partially vocalized texts — some even with Palestinian vocalization — were published by P. Kahle[11]. According to him they date from the eighth to the eleventh centuries C.E., i.e. from a period when Aramaic was still spoken in Palestine. In my opinion, these are the most reliable texts. Except for ordinary scribal errors, they have no faults. Their importance was immediately

7 It is to be regretted that B. Ratner, *Varianten und Ergänzungen des Textes des Jerusalemitischen Talmuds, Ahawath Zion We-Jeruscholaim*, Vilna 1905–1914 (Hebrew), which lists readings of the Palestinian Talmud quoted by early writers, does not cover all of the tractates. As to the clarification of the correct text of TY, see the various articles of J.N. Epstein and S. Lieberman published in *Tarbiz*, especially the following: J.N. Epstein, 'Some Variae Lectionis in Jerushalmi', *Tarbiz*, V (1934), pp. 257–272; 386–387; *ibid.*, VI (1935), pp. 38–55; S. Lieberman, 'Emendations on the Jerushalmi', *ibid.*, II–IV (1931–1934), in several installments.

8 L. Ginzberg, *YFG*.

9 J.N. Epstein, *YFE*.

10 S. Wiedder, 'A fragment of Jerushalmi from Geniza Fragments in Budapest', *Tarbiz*, XVII (1946), pp. 129–135; L. Ginzberg, *GS*, pp. 390–448.[c]

11 P. Kahle, *FPT*. In my opinion the fragments on pp. 63–65 are later. They will be dealt with elsewhere.

recognized by H.L. Ginsberg[12]. According to Kahle, this was also the opinion of Wensinck[13]. Nevertheless, to the best of my knowledge, these texts have not been utilized until now except in Ginsberg's article. It should, however, be noted at the outset that these texts present a type of Aramaic which is *slightly different* from the Galilean type[14].

3) A few other texts of Palestinian provenance, such as the Aramaic portions of *Maasim li-bne Erez Israel*[15] and some writs from Palestine.[a] These texts have been published in the main by S. Assaf[16].

4) The Jewish inscriptions from Palestine (with the exception of Jerusalem. These inscriptions are perhaps written in Official Aramaic and not in the vernacular.)[b] Though the inscriptions are few in number and are for the most part short, they can help us greatly in our study from many points of view[17].

5) Besides these one very important source should be added: Ms. Vat. Ebr. 30 of Bereshit Rabba (Ms.V).[c] In my opinion this is the only reliable text known to date which does not come from the Cairo Geniza.

B. The Other Western Aramaic Dialects

In addition it is important to utilize the other Western Aramaic dialects to a greater extent than has hitherto been done[18]. Middle Western Ara-

12 H.L. Ginsberg, 'Notes on a Palestinian Targum', *Tarbiz*, V (1934), pp. 381–383.

13 P. Kahle, *CG*, p. 129.

14 These will be dealt with in detail throughout the study. Three cases should be pointed out here: 1) The 3 m.pl. perfect is *qṭlw* (as against *qṭlwn* in regular GA. Ginsberg, *op. cit.*, has already pointed this out); 2) The m.pl. participle of the III-*y* verbs has only the form '*nyn* (root '*ny* "to answer") instead of the form '*nyy* in regular GA (See *infra*, pp. 43–46); 3) There are no suffixed object pronouns with the verb. Thus, we find, e.g. the form *yqrb yth* "he will sacrifice it" and not *yqrbnh*. The same holds true for CPA.

15 B.M. Lewin, '*Maasim li-bne Erez Israel* (Palestinian Halachic Practice)', *Tarbiz*, I/1 (1930), p. 100. The fragment seems to have been copied very accurately by a Babylonian scribe.

16 S. Assaf, 'Old Genizah Documents from Palestine, Egypt, and North Africa', *Tarbiz*, IX (1938), pp. 11–34. However, not all of the documents of Palestinian provenance are written in the Palestinian dialect. Some are actually written in the Babylonian dialect!

17 The time has come to publish the inscriptions in one volume. The longest inscriptions were discovered after the publication of S. Klein, *JPCI*. They are all to be found in S. Klein, *SY*, arranged according to place names. (The register of the inscriptions listed in the index is incomplete.) See also: E.L. Sukenik, 'Jewish Tomb-Stones from Zoar (Ghor es-Sâfi)', *Kedem*, II (1945), pp. 83–88 (Hebrew).

18 For the present state of knowledge, see in detail: Rosenthal, *AF*, pp. 104–172.

maic comprises three dialects: 1) Galilean, 2) Samaritan, and 3) Christian Palestinian Aramaic. Neo-Western Aramaic is represented by the dialect of Ma'lūla (Anti-Lebanon). However, it should be noted that the utilization of these dialects for the study of GA is quite complicated.

A grammar of CPA[19] — which is presumed to be the language of Palestinian Jews who were forcibly converted to Christianity during the reign of Justinian — has been written by F. Schulthess[20]. This grammar has several defects: The author never cites his sources, and it is therefore impossible to check him. Occasionally, there is reason to suspect his statements (see further on). It is clear from the book that the author knew practically nothing of GA, except from what he took from Dalman's grammar, and similarly with regard to SA and the Neo-Aramaic dialect of Ma'lūla. He did not properly evaluate the Vatican manuscript of the CPA lectionary — the most important manuscript in my opinion — which employs a type of vocalization system[21]. As the author himself admits, the syntax is not complete[22]. Nevertheless, as F. Rosenthal has rightly pointed out, in comparison to what has been published until now on GA and SA, this is the best book in the field.[a] Previously Schulthess had prepared a good glossary in which he collected the vocabulary of the texts published up until that time[23].[b]

With regard to SA the situation is even worse. There is still no critical edition of the Samaritan Targum[c] and no proper grammar. The material published in Cowley's book[24] to which a glossary is appended may be used. Much material is to be found in two articles published by Dr. Z. Ben-Ḥayyim in *Tarbiz*[25] who utilized GA extensively.[d] He has also

19 Incidentally, there is no *absolute* proof that this dialect originated in Palestine, even though there are many indications of this.

20 F. Schulthess, *Grammatik*.

21 See *ibid.*, p. 10. The lectionary was last published by P. de Lagarde, *Bibliothecae Syriacae*, Göttingen 1892, pp. 257–402. This text is also found in two manuscripts from the monastery of St. Catherine in the Sinai desert. Their text is unvocalized but employs a more *plene* spelling. See: M. Dunlop-Gibson and A. Lewis-Smith, *The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels*, London 1899.

22 These texts have one additional drawback, viz. they are apparently all translations from Greek originals.

23 F. Schulthess, *LS*.

24 A.E. Cowley, *SL*.

25 Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, 'Samaritan Poems for Joyous Occasions', *Tarbiz*, X (1939), pp. 190–200; 333–374.

written a short article on this dialect and its problems[26]. From this article we may discover the principal stumbling block: Most of the texts were composed and copied by people who did not speak Aramaic any more. We find both Hebrew and Arabic influences everywhere. Even *Memar Marqa* of which only parts have been published to date[27] is already influenced by Arabic (due to the copyists?)[28]. Because of this the utilization of this dialect for grammatical as opposed to lexical purposes is at the moment problematical.*

The dialect of Ma'lūla can contribute much to the study of GA and Middle Western Aramaic in general. As opposed to the two above-mentioned Middle Aramaic dialects which are roughly contemporary with GA, this is an Aramaic dialect still spoken to this day in three villages near Damascus. Good phonetic transcriptions of this dialect have been made over the previous decades enabling one to accurately ascertain its structure including its phonetics[29]. These texts have been excellently analyzed by A. Spitaler[30]. Unfortunately, he did not include a syntax. As for the vocabulary, there is only a glossary prepared by G. Bergsträsser[31]. However, it should be kept in mind that more than a thousand years separate this dialect from those of Middle Aramaic. Interestingly enough, developments in this dialect have sometimes followed an Eastern Aramaic pattern (cf. *infra* on the definite article).

Two more Aramaic dialects should be mentioned here: Nabatean and Palmyrene. Both of them are not — or do not intend to be — branches of Official Aramaic. At first glance both dialects are not rooted in the

26 *Ibid.*, pp. 333–337.

27 Z. Ben-Ḥayyim has prepared a critical edition of this work, but as yet no publisher has been found for it.

28 See, e.g. D. Retting, *Memar Marqa*, Bonn 1934, p. 73, n. 24.

29 The texts come from Ma'lūla. Most of them have been published by G. Bergsträsser, *Neuaramäische Märchen und Texte aus Ma'lûla*, Leipzig 1915, and in other places. Texts from the two villages Bab'a and Ǧubb'Abdin have been recorded by S. Reich, *Études sur les villages araméens de l'Anti-Liban*, Damascus 1937.

30 A. Spitaler, *Grammatik*. No copy of this book was available in Israel. Prof. Spitaler himself was unable to find a copy for me, since almost the whole edition was apparently destroyed in the bombing of Leipzig. I should like to take this opportunity to thank Prof. Spitaler for helping me in photographing a copy, to Mr. A. Halper, 'Ein Hashofet, a Jewish Agency representative in Munich, who undertook the photographic work, and to Mr. Omanski of the Jewish Agency Youth Department, who made the work possible. A detailed critical review of the book will appear throughout this study. As Prof. Spitaler informs me in his letter of March 2, 1949, he intends to work on the texts collected by Dr. S. Reich.

31 G. Bergsträsser, *Glossar*.

places where the inscriptions were found, viz. Nabatean in south-eastern Trans-Jordan and the northern Arabian peninsula[32], and Palmyrene in Palmyra in the Syrian-Arabian desert and its environs[33]. It is quite possible that they were not spoken in the same manner in which they were written. But these facts are clear: On the one hand, Nabatean was strongly influenced by Arabic and also has pure Western Aramaic isoglosses. On the other hand, Palmyrene was influenced by Eastern Aramaic, though it is possible that it also contains pure Western traits (see further on).

Finally, here are two instructive examples which show to what an extent corrupt texts can distort the grammatical picture of GA.

Example 1: The determination

mlk means "a king," whereas *mlk'* "the king"; *mlkh* means "a queen," whereas *mlkt'* "the queen." But in all the Eastern Aramaic dialects the force of the determination was lost. Thus: *mlk'* "a king." In CPA and SA the determination is still correctly used. What is the situation in GA? Dalman, who relied on the standard texts, (which due to the copyists are influenced by Eastern Aramaic) concluded that the force of the determination was already lost in GA[34]. This was not Nöldeke's opinion[35]. However, a thorough investigation of reliable GA texts shows that there is no substance to this conclusion. As S. Lieberman has rightly pointed out[36], this fact is specifically stated in the Palestinian Talmud (Nazir X, 2 (51d)): *'yš mhw' lhtpys lw nzyrwt blšwn 'šh tmn 'mryn h' nzyrh 'y 'br* (= *'y'br*) "May a man take upon himself abstinence in the language of a woman? There (i.e. in Babylonia) they say: 'Behold the Nazarite (*nzyrh*) passes.'" This shows that even in the common speech of Palestine the distinction between the absolute and the emphatic states was maintained, while contemporaneously in Babylonia there was already no distinction between these two states. Thus, *nzyr'* which in TA means "a Nazarite (m.)" was felt by speakers of GA to be an indefinite feminine noun *nzyrh* "a Nazarite (f.)." This was a rather unfortunate mistake on the part of scholars,

32 The texts date from *circa* 100 B.C.E. to 300 C.E. The evaluation of this dialect by J. Cantineau (in his otherwise good book), *Le Nabatéen*, I, Paris 1930, pp. 175–180, is incorrect. (I intend to deal with this elsewhere.)

33 The texts date from the first century B.C.E. to the end of the third century C.E. The evaluations of J. Cantineau, *GPE*, pp. 163–164, and F. Rosenthal, *SPI*, p. 105, are close to the truth.

34 P. 121, § 20, 1; p. 188.

35 Th. Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, Strassburg 1904, p. 48.

36 *Tarbiz*, III (1932), p. 456, and *ibid.*, n. 3.

especially since in Ma'lūla the same development took place as in Eastern Aramaic[37]. Thus, at first glance we seem to find evidence for the incorrect assumption with regard to GA.[a]

Example 2:

It will be shown further on that two forms established by Dalman, viz. the 3 f.pl. perfect and the infinitive of the *pe'al*-conjugation are not correct. If there is reason to differ with Dalman on these two basic forms, we certainly cannot trust his statements on the more obscure features of GA.

In light of the foregoing remarks regarding the linguistic editing of GA texts, we may formulate the following rule: *If we find in GA two forms, and one of them is identical with the TA form, it is a priori suspect. Moreover, if this suspect form is not found in any Western Aramaic dialect, it is much more suspect and is in fact to be considered unreliable.*

On the other hand, readings in the printed editions should not be rejected out of hand. Consider the following example: S. Lieberman in his book, *Hayerushalmi Kiphshuto* (Jerusalem 1934), Introduction, p. 12, warns of the danger of rejecting rare readings.[38] He points out that in Y. Ber. II (4c) the reading *lylyh* "to him" occurs instead of the regular *lyh*, and *lylh* twice in Y. Dem. VII, 1 (26a) according to Ms. Vat. Ebr. 133. He adds: "And they certainly spoke this way in some places in Palestine." And, in fact, this form is to be found in the Neo-Aramaic dialect of Ma'lūla: *lēle* "to him," *lēla* "to her."[39] The conclusion is that reliable texts must provide *the basis*, while other texts can be adduced to provide supporting evidence only.

A revision of the grammatical study of GA as proposed here leads to important results in several fields. Firstly, it will be possible to establish the real character of GA. Secondly, the degree of unanimity of Middle Western Aramaic will be clarified more exactly. Only after this will it be possible to move on the third task, viz. to determine the nature of the Aramaic of TO and TJ to the Prophets[40].[b] According to Dalman, it

37 Spitaler, *Ma'lūla*, p. 98. Spitaler, of course, accepted Nöldeke's opinion concerning GA.

38 This was especially stressed by J.N. Epstein.

39 Spitaler, *Ma'lūla*, p. 54, § 39. On this matter, see now: S. Lieberman, *Tarbiz*, XX (1950), pp. 111–112.

40 Only a small portion of this material has been published critically on the basis of Yemenite manuscripts and Geniza fragments.[c] To the editions which Rosenthal, *AF*, p. 128, lists, add: J.F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah*, Oxford 1949.

represents the language of Judea[41]. According to Rosenthal, it is an extension of Official Aramaic which is not — or does not intend to be — connected with a specific geographic area, so that it could be employed throughout the whole Aramaic speaking Jewish Diaspora[42]. According to Kahle its place of origin is Babylonia[43]. At the moment we cannot bring proof from any of the Aramaic works enumerated by Dalman[44] and Rosenthal[45], since their language — to use an understatement — is suspect of being artificial and under the influence of TO, etc.

Moreover, besides having a bearing on these later Aramaic dialects, certain conclusions point to a clarification of the nature of BA. The scholarly debate which began at the end of the preceding century on the subject "Is BA an Eastern or a Western dialect?" ended not many years ago. It goes without saying that on the result of this controversy hinged another important problem: If it became clear that the Aramaic of the Books of Ezra and Daniel was a Western dialect, then, for example, it would be difficult to believe that the Aramaic documents in Ezra were authentic and not forgeries. (From this it follows that there would be serious questions as regards the reliability of these sources concerning the building of the Temple, etc.) At the moment there is no clear-cut conclusion.[a] The current assumption is that the language of the Books of Daniel and Ezra is Official Aramaic which was the accepted literary medium both in the Eastern and in the Western parts of the Persian Empire[46].

Now, after a new clarification of these Aramaic dialects of definite Western origin (with the exception of TO, etc.) we may pose the question differently: Did Official Aramaic originate in the East or in the West? Or conversely: Can the Western Aramaic dialects be considered linear descendants of Official Aramaic or not? Throughout this investigation I will try to hint at these conclusions and finally to sum up and point out the *preliminary conclusions*.

The study of Mishnaic Hebrew will most likely also benefit from a clarification of the Aramaic in GA texts.[b] Scholars dealing with Mishnaic

41 *Grammatik*, p. 13 ff. This is true at least as far as the consonantal text is concerned. The vocalization tradition originated in Babylonia.

42 *AF*, pp. 105; 127 ff.

43 *CG*, p. 117.

44 *Grammatik*, p. 13 ff.

45 *AF*, p. 125 ff.

46 See in detail: *AF*, pp. 60–71; in brief, in my review of *AF* in *Kiryath Sepher* XVIII (1942–1943), p. 177 ff.

Hebrew texts know to what a large extent Palestinian Hebrew was "corrected" by the copyists[47]. Thus, if we find a Midrashic text in which the Aramaic portions were not "corrected" or corrupted we may assume that the Hebrew portions were also more faithfully preserved than in other texts. This is even more so when there is reason to believe that the text itself is of Palestinian origin, i.e. it is a reliable text as defined above.

47 A glance at Epstein, *MNM*, pp. 1207–1269: The Orthography, is very instructive.

2. MS. VAT. EBR. 30 (= MS. V) OF BERESHIT RABBA

COMPARED WITH OTHER RELIABLE TEXTS AND THE OTHER DIALECTS OF WESTERN ARAMAIC

A. The Nature of Ms. V

Since besides the few Geniza fragments described above there is no other reliable text of GA, any addition is very important. In my opinion, Ms. Vat. Ebr. 30 of Bereshit Rabba (= Ms. V) is such a text.

As Ch. Albeck already saw, the text of this manuscript is better than all the others: "*This manuscript is superior in its correct readings to all the other manuscripts.*" (My italics — E.Y.K.)[1]. The late U. Cassuto also concurred in this opinion[2]. It is therefore unfortunate that Theodor, who began the edition of the text, did not print this manuscript as the basic text of the critical edition — even though this manuscript is incomplete. Instead, its readings are buried in the critical apparatus. It is now clear that by comparing the Aramaic portions of this manuscript with other reliable texts and the other Western Aramaic dialects, it will be seen that not only is Ms. V superior to the other manuscripts — even to Ms. L which was printed as the basic text of the edition — but it is the only manuscript containing *authentic GA*, practically uninfluenced by TA. It may be concluded from this that the copyist still understood what he copied. The other manuscripts are full of Eastern Aramaic forms which show that the independent status of GA was unclear to them. According to Cassuto who personally examined the manuscript, it is written in an Eastern hand and dates from the eleventh century C.E. According to J. Schirmann who examined photographs of several pages, the writing is Eastern and dates from the eleventh-twelfth centuries. Thus, from a paleographic point of view there is reason to believe that the scribe lived near a place where, and at a time when GA was still spoken, perhaps in Palestine itself. There seems to be further proof: There appear to be two

1 J. Theodor and Ch. Albeck, *BR*, Introduction, p. 107.

2 U. Cassuto, *Codices Vaticanae Hebraici*, Rome 1956, pp. 36–38. This is contrary to the opinion of J. Theodor in his article 'Drei unbekannte Paraschas aus Bereschit rabba', *Festschrift J. Guttmanns*, Leipzig 1915, p. 148, n. 1.

places in Ms. V where there is Palestinian vocalization[3]: *'antygrph* "a written reply" (*ἀντιγραφή*) 761; *skeyt* (corrected to *sbyt*?) "you saw" 916 (according to the photograph in my possession)[4]. This vocalization system disappeared at a very early period and was only rediscovered in manuscripts from the Cairo Geniza[5]. In my opinion this manuscript is almost as valuable as the Yerushalmi fragments from the Cairo Geniza, and only the fragments of the Palestinian Targum (and, of course, the Aramaic inscriptions from Galilee) surpass them in linguistic importance.

In this study it will be shown through a detailed comparison with reliable texts that this is in fact a reliable text. I will deal first with several linguistic phenomena which will show to what extent the other manuscripts have become corrupted in comparison with Ms. V. Afterwards, several specific linguistic topics will be dealt with in detail. This will shed light on material contained in other reliable texts which have not been utilized up until now. I have occasionally used a new manuscript of *BR* — Ms. Vat. Ebr. 60[a] — from a microfilm in my possession[6]. Most of the

3 Since it is difficult to clarify the matter completely from a photograph this is not certain. There are also some words with Tiberian vocalization. Cf. Albeck, *BR*, Introduction, p. 108.

4 I became aware of the superior nature of Ms. V through the use of the variants in the critical apparatus. However, since Theodor prepared the apparatus until chap. 53 from a handcopy (and not from photographs), and I had encountered readings in Ms. V which surprised me, I ordered a microfilm of the manuscript from the Vatican Library. From the microfilm I ascertained that there are many omissions in the critical apparatus — including whole passages, e.g. p. 247, 1.7: *R. šm'wn bn ywḥyy 'mr ḥwry mwqryn lhwn kl mn dḥzy lhwn kbny 'lhy*' "R. Simeon b. Yoḥai said another (explanation): 'They ... everyone who seems to them to be as the sons of the gods'."

As Prof. Albeck informs me, the copyist's handwriting was difficult to read, and so Theodor had to forgoe listing words whose readings were unclear to him, and this included many words of both textual and linguistic importance. As far as I have checked, there is a marked improvement from chap. 53 on when Theodor used photographs. I have found practically no errors in the section on which Prof. Albeck worked (Chap. 87 on was prepared entirely by him; chaps. 53–86 are partially his work. Cf. the note "To the Reader," before p. 713). I would like to thank my student, Mr. Joseph Levy, who spent several months in Italy, for his aid in securing the photograph for me, and Mr. S. Yeivin, Director of the Israel Department of Antiquities, who kindly permitted me to use the microfilm reader in the department's possession.

5 On the Palestinian vocalization, see Kahle, *MdW*, I, p. 23 ff.

6 The siglum of this manuscript will be V^2. (By rights, Ms. V should be given the siglum V^1, but I did not wish to depart from the usage of the critical edition.) Prof. U. Cassuto brought this manuscript — which was unknown to the editors of BR —

linguistic material quoted in this study differs from the basic text (Ms. L). Sometimes, the basic text is identical with Ms. V since its readings were occasionally preferred by the editors, and I have not always noted this fact. It should be emphasized that not in every place where Ms. V differs from the basic text is the basic text corrupt. Sometimes both readings are correct or — at least — it is not possible at this stage to prove that the reading in the basic text (and in the rest of the manuscripts) is corrupt.

B Grammatical Corruptions in Ms. L and in Other Manuscripts as opposed to Ms. V

With regard to the exactness of Ms. V as opposed to the other mss., the treatment of the determination is an outstanding case in point. In Ms. V, the absolute and the determined states are used properly as in the other reliable texts, in CPA, and in SA. In other mss., the correct use of the determination has been lost under the influence of TA (Thus: *mlk'* "a king," "the king"). E.g.: *ḥdh 'yth* "one woman" 1095; but in the basic text *ḥd' 'tth* (*'tth* "the woman," together with *ḥd'* "one"!). This phrase is also found in several other places, e.g. 362, 363, 932 (read: *ḥdh* for *hdh*). *'yt lk brt* "Do you have a daughter?" 302, but in the basic text *'yt lk brt'* with determination. Also to be preferred is *ḥd qsyṭ dḥmr* "one xestes (a measure) of wine" 503, over the reading *ḥmr'* in the basic text. (This reading may also be explained.)

On the other hand we find in the basic text indefinite nouns with demonstrative pronouns, something which is impossible in Western Aramaic. But in Ms. V the determined state is correctly used: *hdn rpš* "this stamp (of the foot)" 1158, but in the basic text *dyn rpyš*; *hdyn dhb'* "this gold" 162, but in the basic text *zhb* (Hebrew!); *hdn ḥrb'* "this sword" 1275, but in the basic text *ḥd ḥrb'*!

There are many mistakes in *gender*[7]. E.g.: *ḥdh 'ygrh* "a letter" 883, but in the basic text *ḥd 'gr'* (m. indefinite pronoun modifying a f. noun); *wkn hwwh lh* "and so it was" 1095, but in the basic text *hwt* (so also 1096); *mh 'bdt hhy' šynk* "How does your tooth feel?" 306, but in the basic text *'bd*. A particularly interesting example is the following one: *wydyyh*

to my attention. According to him, the manuscript dates from the 10th–11th cents. C.E. Unlike Ms. V which is written in a square script, this manuscript is written in Rashi script. Until now I have investigated only a few of its Aramaic portions. Though superior to Ms. L, it does not seem to be a reliable text.

7 This is connected to some extent with what was discussed in the previous section.

dmḥlšn "And the hands which strip" 733. The form *mḥlšn* was corrected in Ms. V from *mḥlšyn* (m.pl.). In the basic text *dmḥlšyn* (m.pl. – this form can also be explained.) *whynyn yhybn* "and they (f.pl. – i.e. the pearls — *mrglyyn*) are placed" 813, but in the basic text *ynnn yhybn* (m.pl.); *mn d'thwn dḥyw'th dhynyn mdy'n* "from the perspiration of the animals which perspire" 917. The editors here placed V's reading in the basic text (As opposed to the other manuscripts here, V is completely in Aramaic); however in V, *ibid.*, there is a corruption: *ṭ'ynyn* "they (m.pl.) carry" instead of *ṭ'ynn* (f.pl.); *mlyn rkykn* "soft words" 1158, and not *rkykyn* (m.pl.); *mnhn byyšn mynhn 'qrn wmnhn qwwsrn* "some (i.e. of the sheep) are sick, some are sterile, some are sickly" 853. All the forms are f.pl. since they refer to *ṣ'n* "sheep" (f.pl.).

Mistakes in pronouns: *qbylynwn* "he received them" 522, but in the basic text *qblynhw* with the TA m.pl. pronominal suffix *–ynhw*; *dhw'* "that he" 552. In the basic text *d'yhw'* which is a TA form (*'yhw* "he")[8]; *'lwy* "upon him" 699, instead of *'lyh* "upon her"; *mlyhwn drbnn* "the words of the Rabbis" 48, but in the basic text *mlhn*; *mn ywmwy* "from his days" 785, but in the basic text *mn ywmyh* "from his day" (so also 607); *mn 'bd* "who did" 363, and not *mh*; *'lwy* "upon him" 742, and not *'lyw* (Hebrew!); *lmylwy ddn* "to the words of this one" 45, but in the basic text *myly ddn* (construct state); *d' ldn* "this one (f.) to that one (m.)" is exact, since the reference is to a man and a woman; *'lt lqrth hlk bnymwsh* "If you enter (lit. you (m.sg.) entered) a city, follow its custom" 491, and not *nymws'* "the custom" as in the basic text.

Errors in the noun: *'nš* "man" 925, but in the basic text *'ynyš*^{a} which is the TA form; *blyly'* "in the night" 333, but in the basic text *lylh* (Hebrew); *mn gybr* "from a valiant man" 536, and not *gwbry*; *twrgmnh* "his interpreter" 539, and not *trgymnyh*.

Errors in verbal forms: 1) *dhwwt npylh* "(the field) which was in a low state" 628, is to be preferred over *npwlh* (Hebrew); 2) *q'ym* "standing" 639 instead of *q'y* in the basic text which is a TA form; 3) *'twn mqlyn lmlkh* "you are making fun of the king" 690. The form *mqlyn* is to be preferred over *mqylyn* (Hebrew). Even though the *yod* might be considered here to be a sign for the *šĕwā mobile*, nevertheless, this form seems to me to be corrupt. The correct form is approximately [**maqqēlin*] (rt. *qll*). Also the form *'qylnn* (approximately [**'aqqelnan*]) "we have made fun" 690 is to be preferred over *'qlynn*; 4) *m'yynyh* appears in the basic

8 The reading in Ms. L is: *d'hw'* which probably goes back to *d'hw'* < *dhhw'* "which that one." See: Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 112.

text twice on p. 647. For the first occurrence, read with Ms. V[9]: *m'yynh* "to watch" (*pa"el* infinitive)[10]. The form *m'yynyh* cannot be an infinitive an accusative pronoun since this would have to be *m'yynth* or *m'yynh yth*. Cf. similarly *wmpyysh ytyh* "and to appease him" 951, instead of *wmpyysyh* in the basic text; 5) *gysh 'th lmgys'* "an army came to ravage" 1266, and not *lmgyys* (Hebrew); 6) *'yyklt 'šqyt lwwy* "you fed, you gave drink — accompany!" 496. *'klt* in the basic text is a *pě'al* form; 7) *šbqynyh* "leave (f.sg.) it alone" 305 is to be preferred over *šbqyh* in the basic text; 8) *tqnt* "did you tithe?" 650, and not *tqnt'* as in the basic text. 9) *dyyzl* "that he should go" 1145, and not *dnyzyl* (a TA form) in the basic text; 10) *why' 'nyyh* "and she answers" 819, in the *pa"al*-form instead of *m'nyy'* in the basic text.

The preceding examples suffice to show the superiority of V over the other manuscripts, since it is almost completely free of the influence of TA. Here follows a list of a few forms in V which seem to be corruptions under the influence of TA[b] (They are apparently unintentional errors. Most of them appear in the first part of the manuscript): 1) *ḥd zymn'* "one time" 362, should be *ḥd zmn*; 2) *lsgwd* "to prostrate oneself" *ibid.*, should be *lmsgwd*; 3) *'t'bwd* "they occurred" 257 is a TA form. The correct GA form is **'t'bdyn* (f.pl.); 4) *dhtm* "there" 327 is a TA form. The correct GA form is *dtmn*; 5) *ḥd 'ḥh* "one brother" 1144, should be *ḥd 'ḥ*. Perhaps the *alef* of *'ḥ* was the cause of this error; 6) *lhw* "to them" 189, should be *lhwn*. Perhaps this is an intential abbreviation, even though no dot over the word (as a sign of abbreviation) is visible in the photograph. It seems to me that the form *'mry* "they say" 598, 754 should be considered an abbreviation, even though there is no dot; 7) *dnyn* "they judge" 302 is Hebrew and should be *dynyn* (m.pl. part. of an II–*w* verb). However, forms of this type do occasionally occur in CPA and SA, and this is apparently a legitimate Aramaic form.

9 In the second place: *m'yyny*. This is apparently not a corruption, since we find the quadrilitteral verb *m'yyny* in Targum Yerushalmi to Deut 32:10. (See M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, etc.*, New York 1903, and J. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim etc.*, Leipzig 1867, *s.v.* *'wn*. This reading is not found, however, in M. Ginsburger, *Das Fragmententhargum*, Berlin 1899.) The same verb occurs in SA (See Cowley, *SL*, Glossary, *s.v.* *'yn*) meaning "to guard," and therefore *m'yyny* is a participle. According to this, it is also possible to maintain the reading in the basic text. Prof. S. Lieberman has pointed out to me two parallels in TY: *rby šm'wn bn lqyš hwh m'yyny tynyn* "R. Simeon b. Lakish was guarding fig trees" (M. Kat. III, 81d); *ytyb lyh m'yyny lwn* "He sat down to guard them" (Dem. VII, 26b).[a]

10 Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 281; *ibid.*, p. 279.

C. *Ms. V — A Trustworthy Source for the Knowledge of Palestinian Aramaic*

Spelling and Pronunciation

In Palestine — as opposed to Babylonia — [*ā*], whether as a sign of the definite article or as a feminine indicator, was for the most part indicated by *h* and not by ', e.g. *mlkh* "the king," "a queen" and not *mlk'*. We may ascertain this fact from the texts in YFG[11], from other texts, and from Aramaic inscriptions from Palestine. In the Noaran inscription there are twelve instances with *h*. In the el-Ḥammeh inscription there are seven instances with *h* as opposed to only one with '. In the beginning of Ms. V both *h* and ' are used indiscriminately (There are no long Aramaic passages in this part), but from the middle of the manuscript on, *h* predominates and the occurrences of ' are insignificant. For example in the story of the Emperor Diocletian (pp. 688–690), *h* predominates. This is not the case in the other manuscripts, including Ms. L.

In Ms. V we find interchanges of letters[12] which — as far as can be ascertained — appear to be indicative of GA.

b — w: *hšbyr* (H) "he took across" 608, alongside *šyšwwr* (H) "that he should jump" *ibid.*; *dywwny* "of Jabne (Jamnia)" 906; *wṣbḥyn* "and they call" (= *wṣwwḥyn*) 472; *š'bh* (H) "wax" (= *š'wh*) 1136[13]; *lgb* 306, *mlgb* 307 "inside" (= *lgww*, *mlgww*). The forms *bgyw*, *bgyyw* 1239 (all together 5×) also occur; *nwwṭy* "Nabatean" (= *nbṭy*) 486; (*dbyt*) *ḥwrn* "Ḥauran" 854, alongside *ḥwwrn* 861. FPT: *š'b'* "wax" (= *š'wwh*) p. 17 Gen 37:25); *wrbh* "and he became intoxicated" (= *wrwwh*) p. 32 (Gen 9:21); *wrbwn* "they became intoxicated" p. 47 (Gen 43:43). YFG: E.g.: *qyṣwwh* (H) "allotment" (= *qṣbh*) 20_6, 28_2; *hlbyy* "oh that!" (= *hlww'*) 139_6; *m'lby* "from above" (= *m'lwy*) 199_{25}; *gbyl* (H) "parchment" (= *gwwyl*) 203_{17}; *hbwn* "they were" (= *hwwn*) 271_9; *pyryh wrywwyh* (H) "increase and propagation" (= *wrybyyh*) $193_{3,4}$; *rbq* (H) "bachelor"

11 Cf. L. Ginzberg's well put comment in his book, *A Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud*, Vol. I, New York 1941, p. xli: "It is further to be noted that the text of the Palestinian Talmud was often badly transmitted, so that what seems to be faulty editing is sometimes faulty copying"; p. 40 (Hebrew Introduction): ". . . that the scribes in Europe followed the Babylonian orthography which replaced *he* with *alef*" (*vdiswprvm b'rṣwt 'yyrwp' ngrrw 'ḥr hktyb hbbly shḥlyp h b–'*). My point is that the retention of *h* is definite proof that the text is of Palestinian origin and was not tampered with by "Babylonian" copyists. However, one text is known to me in which *h* was replaced by ', but the text itself was not affected, and there are also portions of FPT in which ' predominates, e.g. pp. 6–7.

12 I have only checked the Aramaic portions systematically.

13 This reading is given as a gloss in the margin of Ms. V.

(= *rwwq*) 238_8: *'rqwwṭ* "a high Persian dignitary" (= *'rqbṭ*) 265_{22}. (See *AAC*, p. 27, s.v. *'lqpt*. This spelling is not listed there.) Cf. also Epstein, *MNM*, p. 1223 ff. These changes are often found in SA[14].

ṣ — *s*: *wṣwlqn* (H) "and presses them" 32 (2×) is corrected by a later hand to *mslq*; *mṣṭ'r* (H) "he is troubled" (= *mṣṭ'r*) 639, 672. Cf. Epstein, *ibid.*, p. 1224.

k — *q*: *kštym* (H) "archers" (= *qštym*) 611 (4×). This is a particularly interesting example. The first *t* became *ṭ* under the influence of the *q*[15]. Then afterwards *q* dissimilated to *k*, since as, for example, in Akkadian, two emphatic consonants cannot coexist in the same root. Cf. *kṣyr* "harvest" (= *qṣyr*) in Elephantine Aramaic (Aḥiqar, 1. 127). We may therefore suppose that such a dialect also existed in Palestine. We may pose the question whether the form *tkšyṭ* is not really *tqšyṭ* "decoration." This form occurs in YFG $106_{22,26}$. See Epstein, *MNM*, p. 1227.

b — *p*: *špšptyh* "his branch" 632, 633. In the basic text *šbšbn* (see the commentary). In CPA the form *šwbšbn* occurs; *'pwplsmwn* "balsam" 31 generally appears as *'pwblsmwn* (e.g. 319); *mwbqr* (H) "ownerless property" 837 (2×); *wmbqyrwt* (H) "and they (f.pl.) offer themselves to prostitution" 645; *hbqyr* (H) "he renounced" 693; (*bny 'dm*) *šlhbqr* (H) "outlaws"; cf. *tpšyl* "cooked dish" (= *tbšyl*) FPT 50 (2×) (Lev 21:3), *tpšwly* (H) YFG 274_6, etc. Cf. Epstein, *MNM*, p. 1220[16].

Miscellaneous spellings: *bytw* (H) "his daughter" (= *btw*) 1031, 1232 (cf. Epstein, *MNM*, 1241); *'yqr* "honor" (= *yqr*) 307, *'yqryn* "honors" YFE 16_3. In Y. Ber. 2d, according to the Leyden Ms.: *'yqr*. This was corrected in the manuscript itself to *yqr*, and it appears thus in the *editio princeps* (Venice 1523) which was printed from the Leyden manuscript; *bn* (H) "between" (= *byn*) 666, 718, 837; *ben* (vocalized in V) 1176 (2×); *mbntyym* (H) "from the middle" 681, YFE 124 (3×). This spelling occurs also in CPA and three times in the Noaran inscription. The forms: *šwbth*, *šwbh*, "Sabbath" 689, 728, 1261; *'wp* "also" 346; *byt gwbryn* "Eleutheropolis" 647, 761 (*a* > *o*?), YFG $232_{27,28}$; *whb* "and he gave" (= approximately **wiyhab*) 306. Cf. *dhbwn* "who (m.pl.) gave" (= **dihăbūn*), *dhb* "who (m.sg.) gave" (= **dihab*) in the el-Ḥammeh

14 Several examples from J.W. Nutt, *Fragments of a Samaritan Targum*, London 1874: *bgbkwn* (= *bgwwykwn*) (Lev 26:12) "in your midst"; *wlmlg'b* (= *wmlgw*) (Num 18:7) "and from inside"; *wṣb'nn* (= *wṣbḥnn*) (Num 20:16) "and we shouted"; *bšwyl* (= *bsbyl*) (Num 22:24) "on the path"; etc.

15 See also in Palmyrene and in TY: *qšṭyn*, *qštym* YFG $181_{9,10}$.

16 Perhaps assimilation played a role in some of the examples quoted above.

inscription. The following spellings should also be noted: *hwwd* (= *hwd* "accustomed to" 1035, 1065, 1066 (on p. 1173 "corrected" apparently to *llmwd*); *lymwdym* 673, instead of the regular *lâmud*, *lémudim* (cf. Epstein, *MNM*, p. 1258); *kydyy* "worthy" (= *kdyr*) 253; *rtr* "more" (= *ytyr*) 29, 246, 572, 742, 747, 1064, 1075; *z'wwy* "place" (= *zwwy*) 1123; spellings with ' are found mainly in foreign words, e.g. *qp'dwqyh* "Cappadocia" 785, etc. (Cf. Epstein, *ibid.*, p. 1234).

A very instructive example with regard to the linguistic editing of texts is the word *ywmdn* "today" 1172. S. Lieberman has already noted that the spelling as one word was once very widespread. (It is now very rare: *ywm' dyn* or *ywm dyn*.) Formerly, only one example was known: YFG 149_3. According to this form Lieberman corrected Y. Git. 47_4 by comparison with the Leyden Ms. The phrase: *wmh ḥdtyn yymrwn* (vocalized in the Leyden Ms.: *yewmĕrwn*) should be: *mh ḥdtwn ywmdyn* "What new interpretation have you established today?" With regard to the spelling *ywm dyn*, there is no doubt that it derives from *ywmdyn*. As was pointed out above (§ B, beginning), the demonstrative pronoun is used only with a noun in the determined state, i.e. we should vocalize [*yōmåden*] (= [*yōmå den*]). Proof for this comes from the form in Ma'lūla *imōḏ* "today," where accented $\bar{a} > \bar{o}$[18]. Copyists who did not know the correct pronunciation divided *ywmdyn* into two words *ywm dyn*. The spelling *ywmdyn* alongside *ywm' dyn* is found also in CPA[19].

The preposition *qdm* (= [*qodåm*]) "before" is written mostly *plene* *qwdm* 689 (2×); *qwdmyy* "before me" 689; *qwdmwy* "before him" 689, 815, 818, 1242; corrected to *qwdmwhy* 882; *qwdmh* "before her" 479; *qwdmyhwn* "before them" 689, 690. This is the spelling in CPA[20] and in SA[21]. Defective spellings: *qdmyy* "before me" 307, 363; *qdmyhwn* "before them" 363 (2×). In the vocalized portions of FPT the spelling is defective. (Perhaps the scribes relied on the vocalization); however, in the unvocalized texts, the spelling is mostly *plene*, e.g. *qwdm* "before" 39 *qwdmyy* "before me" 38, 52, 53, 57, etc.; *qwdmyk* "before you (f. sg.)" 43.

The preposition *qbl* (approximately: [**qobål*]) "towards" is similar: *lqwblh* "towards him" (in the basic text *lqyblh*) 682; *lqwbyy* "towards me" 1234; *lqwbly* "towards me" FPT 40. The spelling *khwqbl* "opposite"

17 *Hayerushalmi Kiphshuto*, Introduction, p. 23.
18 Spitaler, *Ma'lūla*, p. 120.
19 Schulthess, *LS*, *s.v.*
20 *Ibid.*, *s.v.*
21 Since this is very common in Nutt, *op. cit.*, no examples need be brought here.

01ᵉ is interesting. Cf. also FPT 39; *ib.* 19 (2×): *kĕlâqbḳl* (so vocalized) (see Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 231, § 7). This form also occurs in CPA[22], Ma'lula[23], and in Syriac[24]. As in FPT the spelling *klqbl* 438 also occurs. In BA *kl qbl*.

In Ms. V: *l'whṛy tr'h* "behind the door" 639, instead of: *l'ḥwry* in the basic text. This form occurs in Y. B. Bath. 13b (according to Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 230), in YFG 10_{15} (*lwḥrwy*), and even in CPA[25]. In an Aramaic fragment of the so-called *Sepher Ha-Maasim*, published in *Tarbiṣ*. I (1931), Part I, p. 100: *lwḥr* (a singular form!). This seems to be a transition stage for the form *roḥl* in Ma'lūla where metathesis has taken place[26].

Spelling with yy is proof of the tendency against the contraction of the diphthong *ay*, e.g. *byyty* "my house" 1234, *dbyytk* "of your house" 785, *byytyh* 431, 1234, *lbyytyh* "to his house" 1232 (5×), 1242; *'yynwy* "his eyes" 1038, 421 (written *'yynyy*), *'yynh* "the eye" 551; *myynwqyyh* "the children" 543, 688, 1061; *ḥyyly* "my strength" 1253, *ḥyylk* "your strength" 197 (2×), *ḥyylh* "the strength" 1241, *ḥyylkn* "your (m.pl.) strength" 582; *myyth* "she dies" 648; *qryytwn* "you (m.pl.) called" 648; *thyymyn* "you (m.sg.) will believe" 455. Of course, spellings with one *y* are also found, e.g. *tnyth dbyth* 1095 — *tnyyth dbyyth* 1069 "the beam(?) of the house" 1096. This tendency is clear in FPT, particularly in the vocalized fragments. Here are a few examples from YFG: *'yynyyh* "the eyes" 6_{15}, *'yyny'* "the eyes" 30_{17}, *'yynyh* "his eye" 132_{20}; *myynwqh* "the child" 9_{18}. Does the spelling *rwḥwyy* "his spirits" 236 indicate a pronunciation *rūḥoy* (= *rwḥwhy*) as occurs in FPT?

lšm—lšn "language":[a] *kl hšmwt hllw lšm mrdwt hn* "all these names are terms of rebellion" 236; *kwln bšm mrdwt hn* 618 (3 mss.: *lšm*). As pointed out by Epstein, *MNM*, p. 1232, this form occurs in *Mechilta D'Rabbi Ismael* (ed. Horovitz-Rabin), p. 247: *ykwl tqr'nw 'bd lšwm bzywn*, and several times in the Palestinian Talmud: *lšm* (=*lšn*) *mtnyt'* "language of the Mishnah." The forms *lšwn mrdwt* 255, *lšwn mrd* 246 occur. Also: *bwrgr lšm bwrgrwth* (= *lšn bwrgrwth*; several mss.: *lšwn*) "as the burgarius is called by the name of his castle" 337. According to Epstein,

22 Schulthess, *Grammatik*, p. 38.
23 Spitaler, *Ma'lūla*, p. 128.
24 C. Brockelmann, *Syrische Grammatik*[7], Leipzig 1955, § 52, Anm. 1. The explanation for the phenomenon is given there.
25 Schulthess, *Grammatik*, p. 59.
26 Spitaler, *Ma'lūla*, p. 131.

there is an interchange of *n–m* here (as opposed to the change *'dn* — *'dm* "man"). The fact that in all the above-mentioned examples the word occurs before the labials *b* and *m* points to a different explanation, viz. assimilation (complete or partial). However, against this explanation: *'lsryn 'wmryn lšm 'lsr* "'*ilsārīn* called after Ellasar (Gen 14:1)" 408–409. It is therefore not possible at the moment to decide the matter. See also S. Lieberman, *Tosefeth Rishonim*, Part II (Jerusalem 1938), p. 281. Add here also the form *'dn* (H) "man" 29, 30, 36, 585, 617, 635, 652, 706. This form is found also in mss. of the Mishnah and of the Palestinian Talmud (Epstein, *MNM*, p. 1230).

Other spellings:

šlw' (H) "that it is not" (= *šl'*) 599; *gw'* "inside" 247 are similar to the orthography of the Dead Sea Scrolls[a] (cf. Epstein, *ib.*, p. 1246). *y* for *h*: *mrmy by* (H) "you deceive me" 776 (2×); *mšry* (H) "cause to dwell" 482. *'n* (= *'yn*) (H; negative particle): 860 (2×; the second time "corrected" by an inserted *y*), 957, 964, 968, 973 (vocalized *'en*), 979, 1018; *w'ny* "and I am not" (= *w'yny*) 993, 1019 ("corrected" to *w'yny*). The interesting spelling *šlyprwṣym* (H) "of (a band) of brigands" 699 shows that the possessive particle *šɛl* was still pronounced together with the following word; cf. *mṭtw šlšlmh* "Solomon's bed" (Song 3:7).

The Noun

pm — *pwm* "mouth": This word may serve to show to what an extent the ordinary editions of GA texts were "corrected." In the Babylonian Talmud the only form is *pwm*; in CPA and SA *pm*[27] (in CPA also *pym*). According to the readings in the ordinary GA texts the form is *pwm* (Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 201) — against the other Western Aramaic dialects. However, in FPT the form is always *pm*, *pym* vocalized *pem*, *pem*, e.g. 19, 20 (several times), 21, 33, 34, 44, etc. The one instance of *pum* 58 (see *ib.*, n. 2) is probably a late vocalization. (Most of the fragment is unvocalized.) The form *pwm* occurs in the last fragment (p. 63) which is a

27 This is the translation in the Samaritan Targum everywhere for Hebrew *ph*. Dr. Z. Ben-Hayyim confirms this for me from his own lexical files. Interestingly, Cowley, *SL*, Glossary, *s.v. pwm*, lists the plural *pmmyh* as belonging to a singular *pwm*! The few instances of *pwm* in CPA are either errors in reading or are influenced by Syriac. See: Th. Nöldeke, *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, Strassburg 1910, p. 177, n. 5, where a detailed treatment of this word and its Semitic cognates is given.

[illegible] poem for the seventh day of Passover. However, this fragment [illegible] related to PT, and from a linguistic point of view it belongs [illegible] of the liturgical poems mentioned there by Kahle which also [illegible] traces of Eastern influence. Examples from YFG: *pm* 4_{23}, 6_{21}, [illegible] $142_{11\text{-}15\text{-}19}$, 204_{24}, 224_{20}, 258_{36}, 259_{10}; however, *pwm* [illegible] 210_6; YTF 129_{31}. Whereas in YFG *pwm* occurs in only one [illegible] the examples, in the printed editions — as far as I compared — [illegible] occurs. At first glance it is strange that *pym* never occurs in the [illegible] however, if we take into account the difficulty of distinguishing [illegible] *w* and *y* in manuscripts, the question arises whether we should [illegible] read *pym* in all or most of the places where *pwm* occurs. The evidence [illegible] V seems to bear out this supposition.[a]

[illegible] V 197 (2×) (*lpm*, not *lps*), 681, 694, 721, 952. On p. 197, L also [illegible] however, the editor "corrected" it to *pwm*! The only definite examples of *pwm* in V are the following: 170, 247 (2×), 767. At first [illegible] *pym* does not seem to occur in the *variae lectionis*; however, wherever it indeed occurs it was either not properly recorded or not recorded at all: *'nh pth pymy* "I open my mouth" 696, is clearly visible on the photograph, but is not recorded at all. On p. 712 read: *lpymyh* "into his mouth," and not *lpwmyh*. The reading *lpmyh* in L was again "corrected" by the editor. Similarly read: *bpymh* "in his mouth" 813. The form *bpwmh* is given for Ms. Z (a Geniza fragment), which most likely should be read *bpymh*. On p. 694, *lpymyh* "to his mouth" was clearly "corrected" in Ms. V to *lpwmyh*. The reading *pwm* or *pym* is uncertain on [illegible] On p. 1011, the reading appears closer to *pwm* than to *pym*. Since in the literature under discussion every [*o*] is noted by *w*, but not every [*e*] by [illegible] it is clear that *pm* = *pym*, but not *pwm*. In light of these examples we may [illegible] in the previous paragraph) express our doubts as to whether *pwm* is [illegible] reads *pym*. As to the certain occurrences of *pwm*, they are to be attributed either to the beginning of Eastern influence (TO?) or to the [illegible] of BA.

[illegible] word shows to what a great extent the ordinary texts were "corrected." The clarification of the correct form of this word may lead to [illegible] reaching conclusions in several directions. Firstly, it becomes clear [illegible] in this regard the unity of the three Middle Western Aramaic dialects [illegible] greater than was supposed, since we find *pm* — *pym* in all of them. (The [illegible] conclusion will be reached in succeeding paragraphs.) Secondly, [illegible] knows only *pwm*. Therefore, in its present form the text of TO cannot [illegible] Palestinian. Moreover, this is important for establishing the pronunciation of BA. The spelling in BA, in Elephantine Aramaic, and in the

ancient Aramaic inscriptions (e.g. Nerab 2, l. 4) is *pm*[28]. According to the orthographic rules of these documents (as opposed to GA), nothing can be learnt concerning the pronunciation of the word, except that it does not belong to the II–*w* class. However, in BA the word is vocalized *pum*. Therefore, even though nothing can be learnt about the provenance of the biblical *consonantal text*, the *vocalization* clearly points to a Babylonian tradition. In Mishnah Abot V, 23 the text is vocalized *pum* according to Ms. Kaufmann A 50.

br–ḥyryyh—br ḥyryn "freeman": *br ḥyryyh* 1137, *br ḥyryn* 1138. Even though *br ḥwryyh* 1055 occurs, it may be a correction (in a Hebrew passage: *wbn ḥwrym 'šh kḥyrwtw* "The freeman acted in accordance with his freedom" 1240 (2×)). This form is not a corruption. In CPA the form is *br ḥryn* with a dot under the *ḥ*, which indicates an *i*-vowel or the like. This is, therefore, a form related to Mishnaic Hebrew *ḥerūt* "freedom".

byyšh — byšh "sick person": This word was "corrected" under the influence of Aramaic *byš* "bad": *'bymy hwh mbqr byyšyh* "Abimi used to visit the sick" 125 is the reading in L (Ms. V is deficient in this chapter). The editor put the reading *byšyyh* in the basic text. But on p. 853, according to V: *byyšn* "sick" (f.pl.). This is undoubtedly the correct form since *byyš* occurs in FPT, in CPA (sometimes spelled *b'š*), and in SA (e.g. *'bwk bh'š* "your father is sick" Samaritan Targum to Gen 48:1; in the Samaritan orthography *h* = '). I also found this "correction" in a manuscript. I checked the first example in Ms. V[2], and it appears that the original reading *byyšyh* was crossed out and "corrected" above the line to *byšyyh*. Also, Kohut in *AC*, s.v. *byš*, quotes *byyšyh* from the Palestinian Talmud but concludes that it is a corrupt form.

ḥmwrth "drove of asses," *gmwlth* "stock of camels," *bqwrth* "herd of cattle": *wyhy ly šwr wḥmwr . . . lyšnhwn dbryyth hy' ḥmwrth gmlwth* "I have acquired cattle and asses" (Gen 32:6) — This is as people say: A drove of asses, a stock of camels" 892. This is the reading in V and L. Read, however, with Ms. G (a manuscript close to V): *gmwlth* .This reading is found also in *Midrash Haggadol*[29]: *ḥmwrt' gmwlt'* (according to Ms. Q). It is clear that these readings are correct, since it is impossible to imagine how the common ending *–wt* could have been corrupted. The

28 For Biblical Aramaic, see: Gesenius-Buhl, *s.v.*; for Elephantine, see: Cowley, AP Index, *s.v. pm*; for Nerab, see: G.A. Cooke, *A Textbook of North-Semitic Inscriptions*, Oxford 1903, p. 179.

29 Ed. M. Margulies, Jerusalem 1947, p. 562.

form *bqwrth* parallels these two forms: *wrḥṭ* '(*brhm*) *lbqwrth* "And Abraham ran to the herd of cattle" (referring to Gen 18:7: "And Abraham ran to the cattle") FPT 49. In my opinion, the noun pattern here is *qəṭullā* which occurs in Biblical Hebrew as a general noun: *ʿabuddā* (Gen 26:14; Job 1:3) "a group of slaves." Compare Arabic *jubullā* "masses of people"[30]. The relation between this form and *bqwrt* "herd of cattle" in Mishnaic Hebrew should be clarified[31].

ḥbšwbh — ḥdbšwbh "Sunday": This form, without *d*, is found twice (p. 689) only in Ms. V. In the first instance (line 1), a *d* was added above the line (not listed in the *variae lectionis*); however, in line 6, the form was not "corrected." This form is found in SA: *ʿbšbh* (= *ḥbšbh*)[32]. So also in Maʿlūla: *ḥašoppa*[33] (also without *b*) and similarly in modern dialects of Eastern Aramaic[34].

nwhr' — nhwrh "light": *ḥd sgy nwhry* "one blind man (lit. one of much light)" 1137. (There are erasures in the text. Was the original reading *nwhryyh*?) In V, *R. nwhry — nwhryy* "R. Nuhrai" occurs instead of *R. nhwr'y*, e.g. 834 (3×), 1133, etc.; *sgy nwhryh* "the blind man" YFG 40_{14}; *R. nwhryy ib.* 148_{13}, 238_{20}; YFE 131_{29}, etc. Therefore, in GA the form was *nwhrh* and not *nhwrh*. But in CPA the form is *nhwr'*[35]. Nothing can be learnt with regard to *nĕhōrå* (Dan 2:22 Q), even though the GA form occurs in Maʿlūla[36].

z'wr — z'yr "small": This is another instructive example. Here also, this concerns not only linguistic editing, but also other problems connected with the correcting of this corruption. *z'wr* occurs twice in V: 625, 628. According to the photograph, *z'wr* occurs twice on p. 690. (The foot of the ' touches the bottom of the *y*. Nevertheless, the letter is longer than *y*, and the head is that of a *w*.) No example of *z'yr* is to be found in V. In YFG, the form *z'wrh* (name of a Rabbi) mostly occurs instead of *z'yrh*, e.g. $19_{9,11}$, 149_{8}, $150_{3,8}$, 156_{1}, etc. (This form occurs occasionally even in the printed editions). *R. z'wrh* "R. Zeorah" in V: 649–650 (3×) (also *R. z'yrh*). To the extent that the reading *R. z'yrh* in reliable texts

30 J. Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*, Leipzig 1894, § 195 c.

31 Cf. the dictionaries (following a conversation with the late G. Allon).

32 Cowley, *SL*, Glossary, *s.v. ʿbšbh*. In SA, because of the loss of the gutturals ' = *ḥ* is common.

33 Spitaler, *Maʿlūla*, p. 116.

34 A.J. Maclean, *A Dictionary of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac*, Oxford 1901, p. 92.

35 This cannot be attributed to the influence of Syriac which has *nuhrå*.

36 Bergsträsser, *Glossar, s.v. nhr.*

is correct, it may be attributed to the fact that one of the Rabbis who bore this name was a Babylonian[37].

When it is also noted that in the Jericho inscription[38] discovered about 10 years ago, the phrase *rbyh wz'wryh* "the great and the small" is found[39], it is difficult to escape the conclusion that *z'wr* suffered the same fate as *pm — pwm*. In CPA, only *z'wr* occurs. In SA, apparently only(?) this form occurs[40]. This is the case also in Ma'lūla[41]. It is now quite clear that in Western Aramaic the form was *z'wr* and not *z'yr*[42]. *z'wr* occurs also in Dura-Europos[43]. *A priori* the form *zĕ'ērā* found in BA (Dan 7:8) and in the Targum clearly points to the Eastern provenance of these documents.

In actual fact the matter is much more complicated. There is no contradiction in the form *z'yryyh* YFG 29_6, *z'yryn* 280_2 "small ones," since it may be assumed that the *y* is actually a *w*. However in FPT we find: *zĕ'eyrā' kazĕ'eyrūteh* 20 (Gen 43:33); *zĕ'erå'* 21 (Gen 44:12; so vocalized); *z'yrth* 34 (Gen 29:18); *z'yrh* 47 (Gen 44:29; 33). (There is no reason to doubt Kahle's reading, especially regarding the vocalization.) Since at present there is no reason to assume that there is any Eastern influence in FPT[44], the following conclusion seems inescapable: In at least one Palestinian Aramaic dialect the form *z'yr* existed. Therefore, the above conclusion with regard to BA and the Targumim is unfounded.

There is also an alternative explanation: Perhaps there is actually no difference between East and West (i.e. a geo-linguistic difference), but there is a difference between earlier and later forms (i.e. a diachronic difference). A deeper look into the problem shows that Syriac, an Eastern dialect (differing in several points from TA and Mandaic) knows only *z'wr*, whereas TA knows only the form *zyr'* (< *z'yr'*) and that only as a

37 On this name, see: Epstein, *MNM*, pp. 1297–1302.

38 *SY*, *s.v. yryḥw*.

39 With regard to the reading, there is no room for doubt. The foot of the *w* cannot be longer as I ascertained from a photograph of the inscription which I checked together with Dr. M. Avi-Yonah.

40 See, e.g. the Samaritan Targum to Lev 25:52; Num 16:9, 13; etc. Interestingly, Cowley, *SL*, Glossary, *s.v. z'r* lists one example: *z'wr* = *z'yr* (for which there is no reference!).

41 Bergsträsser, *Glossar*, p. 104.

42 Brockelmann, *GVG*, I, p. 353, says simply: "Im westaram. *ze'ōr* "klein", jem. syr. *ze'ōr* entspricht." See *infra*.

43 E.L. Sukenik, *The Synagogue of Dura Europos and its Frescoes*, Jerusalem 1940, p. 160 (Hebrew).

44 See above, § 1a 2.

personal name[45]. It does not exist as an adjective, and apparently is non-existent also in Mandaic. As far as can be ascertained from Maclean's dictionary[46], the form in Modern Syriac derives from *zĕ'ōr*. On the other hand in Ancient Aramaic, i.e. in BA, Elephantine[47], Nabatean[48] and Palmyrene[49, 50] the forms are *z'yr'*, *z'r'* (apparently = *z'yr'*). With regard to TO and TJ to the Prophets which know only *z'yr* this is quite interesting. The hypothesis, therefore, is approximately as follows: In Ancient Aramaic the form which dominated was *z'yr*. The form *z'wr* arose in one (which one?) of the dialects and replaced *z'yr*[51]. The form *z'yr* survived, on the one hand, only in the ancient sources as a rare form in the West in FPT, and, on the other hand, in the personal name *z'yr'* — *zyr'* mainly in the East.

'ydh — *'yd'* "the hand": This form occurs on p. 1247. It is found in FPT 2 (2×) and in BR 264 in Mss. V[2] (before correction) G K: *'yd l'yd* "hand to hand." This is the form also in SA[52] and CPA[53].

ṭrw — *ṣry* "resin": *ḥwmr qṭyp ḥmwry wṭrw* 1135, is given as an explanation of *nk'ṭ ṣry* "balm, gum" (Gen 43:11). *ṭrw* is the Aramaic form parallel to Hebrew *ṣry*. In both Syriac *ṣrw'* (determined form) and Arabic *ḍrw*, *w* and not *y* occurs[54]. With regard to *qṭyp ḥmwry*, cf. *hm'rb* . . .

45 Epstein, *MNM*, p. 1302.

46 Maclean, *op. cit.* (p. 23, n. 34), p. 88.

47 See the references in Cowley, *AP*, Index.

48 This dialect is in intention a continuation of Official Aramaic. For the time being, cf. Rosenthal, *AF*, p. 92.

49 Cantineau, *GPE*, p. 107.

50 This dialect, like Nabatean, at first glance is but a branch of Official Aramaic, even though it possesses many late traits. For a summary, see: Rosenthal, *AF*, p. 101; in greater detail, see: *idem*, *SPI*, p. 105.

51 *Zĕ'ēr* is a Semitic *quṭayl*-form; *zĕ'ōr* a Semitic *quṭāl*-form. Both are diminutive forms. See: Brockelmann, *GVG*, I, §§ 135, 137. In my opinion, it is highly doubtful whether Brockelmann (following Barth) is correct in taking BH *zĕ'ēr* as a borrowing from Aramaic (*ibid.*, p. 352). The examples of *qĕṭēl* in the Aramaic dialects as listed by Brockelmann are no more numerous than those in Hebrew. If we find two forms in Aramaic we may pose the following question: Is the opposite, perhaps, true? Perhaps Official Aramaic borrowed this word (i.e. *zĕ'ēr*) from Hebrew-Phoenician, but later on the original Aramaic word (i.e. *zĕ'ōr*) (to the extent that this root was preserved at all!) replaced it. At the moment, there is no proof for this opinion, just as there is no proof for the opposite assumption.

52 Cowley, *SL*, Glossary, *s.v. 'd*. See also the Samaritan Targum for Hebrew *yd*.

53 Schulthess, *Grammatik*, p. 44. Also in Ma'lūla: Bergsträsser, *Glossar*, p. 19.

54 In detail, see: Löw, *Flora*, III, p. 391. As he points out, *ibid.*, p. 394, the word is apparently a loanword in Aramaic.

ḥlb ḥmwr bqṭp (Sifra (ed. Weiss), p. 28a) and Löw's explanation[55]. The matter, however, requires further study.

Numerals

Some new forms of several numerals are worthy of attention.

tryyn — tryy — trn "two" (m.); *trtyytn — trtyy — trtn* "two" (f.). The spelling with *yy* (e.g. 330 (3×), 455, 569, 1264) shows that the pronunciation was approximately [**tĕrayīn*]. The spelling *tryy* 30 is also found: *trtyyn* 327, 357, 411, 427; also *trtyy* 1176, 1177, 1285. The forms *tryy* and *trtyy* are definite GA forms and are not due to Babylonian influence. Further on it will be shown that in GA (and even in Ma'lūla), *n* was apocopated after the diphthong *ay* in word-final position. Of course, nothing can be learnt of the pronunciation from the following forms: *tryn* 307, 368, 511 (2×; second time dittography), 527, 536, 729 (2×), 969, 1236, 1241; *trtyn* 157, 327, 360, 1183 (2×), 1261, 1262.

It should be pointed out that *trtn* also occurs: 814, 855, 959, 1262. In YFG 4_{25} *tryyn*; however, the prevalent form is *tryn*: 4_{23}, 17_{6}, $112_{8,9}$, 153_{17}, 170_{8}, 216_{2}, 249_{31}. Also: *trtyn* 157_{20}, and even *trtyy* 205_{25} YFE 124; YFL 248, 259; also *trtyn* 244, 245; *tryn* 244, 257. In *Ginze Schechter*: *tryn* 390, 435; *try* (apparently = *tryy*) 427; *trtyn* 406 (2×); *trty* (apparently = *trtyy*) 394[56]. Just as it is impossible to come to any definite conclusion from these forms, so also from the following forms in Palestinian deeds: *tryn* (*Tarbiz*, IX (1938), p. 28); *trtyn* (*ib.*, p. 26).

In FPT the prevalent form is *tryyn* 19, 41, 51, 52 (3×), 55, 61 (vocalized: *tĕrayn*. Did the vocalizer at least read [**tĕray*]?); also *trtyn* 10, 52; *trtn* 10.

tryhwn — trwyhwn "the two of them": This word again exemplifies clearly the problems connected in clarifying the original form of G.A. In CPA, only *tryhwn* is found (so also in Syriac) and similarly in S.A.[57]. (The form does not survive in Ma'lūla.) In the Babylonian Talmud the form is *trwyyhw*, i.e. with an additional *w*.

55 *Ibid.*, p. 371.

55[a] While this article was in press, I received D.S. Loewinger's article, 'New Fragments from the Yerushalmi Pesahim ch. 5–7', *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume*, New York 1950, pp. 237–286. This reliable text will be designated as YFL. I would like to thank Prof. Loewinger for sending me an offprint of this article.

56 See *infra*, n. 60.

57 Cf. the Targum of *šnyhm* (e.g. Num 7:13; etc.).

What is the situation in GA? According to Dalman (*Grammatik*, p. 170) both forms exist. However, in YFG in practically every case *tryhwn* occurs: 10_{16}, 20_{11}, 21_{4-5}, 69_4, 78_{5-6}, 100_8, 115_6, 129_{11}, 130_{12}, 158_6, 159_{6-12}, 178_{14}, 206_{10}, 209_{13}, 233_{16}, $242_{10-13-14}$, 244_{21}. As far as I compared, *trwyhwn* occurs in these places in the regular editions! Cf. also: *trwyhwn* occurs in YFL 20; YFF 125. *trwyhwn* occurs in YFF 23; however, as Lieberman has proven, this fragment belongs to Maimonides' *Laws of the Palestinian Talmud*.[58] It is interesting to note how Maimonides grafted the Babylonian form onto that of the Palestinian Talmud. (*pwm* is also found in these Laws!) Thus, according to the data from these two reliable texts, we may unequivocably conclude that *trwyhwn* (as *pwm*) is due to the copyists.

The situation in V complicates matters somewhat. On the one hand we find *tryhwn*: 162, 248, 250, 274, 302, 428, 539, 1254[59]. On p. 302_4, *dryhwn* is given as V's reading in the *variae lectionis*; however, read according to the photograph: *dtryhwn* (a corruption for *dtryhwn*). *trwyhwn* 1055, according to the photograph, seems to have been corrected from *tryhwn* by a later hand.[a] There are, however, at least five certain occurrences of *trwyhwn* in V: 537, 703, 1254, 1255 (2×). It seems to me that if there is no "correction" here — a matter which is difficult to clarify from the photograph — this should be considered the beginning of the tendency to replace *tryhwn* by *trwyhwn*. This tendency is also in evidence in another reliable text — albeit the least reliable one[60] — viz. *Ginze Schechter* — which has only *trwyhwn*: 420, 425 (2×; in the parallel in TY: *tryhwn*!); however, *tryhwn* in the Yerushalmi fragments published *ibid.*: 440, 441, 443; *tryhwn* also in YFL 271, 283. When we take into account the tendency to replace this form with *trwyhwn* we must conclude that according to the evidence of the best reliable text only *tryhwn* is

58 S. Lieberman, *The Laws of the Yerushalmi*, New York 1947 (Hebrew). [This was pointed out to me by the late J.N. Epstein.]

59 The following example (p. 162) demonstrates how a Western form "develops" into an Eastern form: Ms. V — *tryhwn*; L — *trwyhwn*; R — *trwwyhwn*. These forms still preserve word-final *n* as in GA, but we find already in O[1] — *trwyhw* and in O[2] — *trwwyhw*. This is the TA form!

60 This refers to the "Abridged Legends of the Yerushalmi," *GS*, I, pp. 429–430. The abridger included also a portion in Babylonian Aramaic (pp. 392–393). In several places he is not particular with regard to Palestinian orthography, e.g. pp. 402, 415 *ynʾy* "Yannai," for *ynyy*; pp. 391, 427, 428 (2×): *qdmʾy* "first," for *qdmyy* (but *qdmyy* (2×), p. 428). There are also errors, e.g. *ḥdʾ ʾnṯʾ* "one woman" p. 403, as well as spellings with word final ʾ instead of *h*.

[illegible] The "collected" tendency is clearly shown in the following examples. In P. Ber 116 (-) 72, according to the Leyden file [illegible] the Greek addition was printed, the reading is unclear. This reading is "corrected" in the manuscript to [illegible] and then to the form which was printed. According to P[illegible] p. 116, the original reading was [illegible] that also was "corrected" in the manuscript to [illegible] (see note [illegible]).

Here again the reading is not so simple. In Palmyrene texts we find [illegible] evidence against. This would justify the assumption that both forms existed in Old Aramaic since this dialect was influenced to a great extent by Eastern Aramaic. But the existence of Palmyrene is inexplicable in light of the aforementioned grounds. It seems clear that only [illegible] in Eastern Aramaic, and Palmyrene is due to the copyists.

ʾlp — *ʾlp*[illegible] "ox," *ʾlpyn* — *ʾlpyn* "oxen"; *ʾlpkh* 814 (on this see Z. [illegible] Grenze Imgarsiali, on this see FPT 51, 59 (2×); in a Greek fragment published by Littmann: *ʾlpkh γραικιστι* (l. 1), *ʾlph γραικιστι* (l. 6) "six days." This is the spelling also in CPA: *ʾlpyn* YBG 256[illegible] "oxen"; but Ms 1 (6?) *ʾlpyn* [illegible] on the Aramaic inscription from Zeret Sharyn, this is also a Palestinian spelling. But see *ʾlpyn* "five years 368)."

ʾlp — *ʾlph* "ox"; *ʾlpyn* "oxen"; *ʾlpkh* 623, and so always in FPT, e.g. 52, 11; [illegible] *ʾlpyn* "oxen"; YBG 256[illegible]; and so in CPA and in Mo[illegible] *ʾlpʾn*.

ʾlp[illegible] *ʾlpʾyn* "ten ass tolleroms (a coin)": On p. 503 read rather *ʾlpy ʾlpʾyn*. This form occurs also in FPT: *ʿšry* "ten," *ʾlpy* "years", with a noun in the determinate state: *ʿšry nsqʾ* "ten years ago" ib. 46. This form occurs also in CPA. See also Dalman, Grammatik, p. 129. The usage here in V with a noun in the absolute state is strange. The following also is an example of a numeral in the construct state: *tltyy ḥrnyyʾ* "the three others (f pl.)" 446. If the ending is accurate, the pronunciation is [ay] and not [ē]. This form occurs also in CPA.

(1) [illegible] GVI, p. 81.

(2) Ibid., p. 105, and note.

(3) S. Levi[illegible], Les inscriptions bilingues des Pseudo-Lentuli, Journal A. Hudson, [illegible] Palmyrene Texts, p. 21.

(4) Jaussen, Savignac, Inscriptions A, p. 64, l. 6. Perhaps the reason for not A the [illegible] of the form *mʾh* (= *mʾʾh*) "and four", ibid., l. 7. Cf. also [illegible] *ʾrbʿmʾh*, "and four hundred" YBG 169[illegible]. Cf. also the pronunciation of the word in the words *ḥdʾ ḥmyšʾ*, *ḥdʾ ʿšrʾ*, *ḥdʾ ʿšrʾ* by the Tiberian Masoretes as [illegible] on the [illegible] MdW, I, p. 31).

The Verb

Infinitive of the pĕ'al conjugation: Dalman (*Grammatik*, p. 279) states that the *pe'al* infinitive is both *mqtl* (*miqṭal*) and *mqtwl*. The only form in TO is *mqṭl*. This fact alone is enough to arouse suspicion. And, in fact, only *mqṭwl* occurs in FPT.[a] Even when the orthography is defective, the vocalization indicates the pronunciation of the form, e.g. *lmṭ'wn* "to claim" 7; *lmqṭwl* "to kill" *ib.*; *lĕmeġzor* "to circumcize" 11 (bot.), *lĕmṭhkom* "to know" 19; *meqsowm* "to divine" 20 (bot.), 21 (but used as a noun *bĕmagzar* "in circumcizing" 11!); *lmdḥwl* "to fear" 27; etc. In light of these examples, it seems reasonable to assume that even in unvocalized texts when there is no *w* the pronunication was still [*ō*]. In V almost all of the examples which come into consideration (see below) are written with *w*. Moreover, when the spelling was defective, a later hand (V^0) added a *w*: *lmš'wl* "to ask" 37, 932, 951 (V^0); *lmkws* "to slaughter" 601; *mswq* "to ascend" 974; *lmzbwn* "to purchase" 906; *mymwr* "to say" 305; *lmḥswl* "to complete" 907 (2×) (The reading was put in the basic text); *lmqṭwl* "to kill" 1128; *lmšrw'* "to trip, fall down" 1241; *mmrd* "to rebel" 712, corrected by V^0 to *mmrwd*. We even find *m'bwd* "to do" 665. (This form is vocalized in FPT 11: *lm'bed*, since the imperfect — and the infinitive is presumably dependent on the imperfect — is [*nɛ'bed*] in Aramaic.) Also with suffixed pronouns: *mzqwpynyh* "to lift him up" 1238. Examples without *w*: *lmyqrb*, *lmqrb* "to approach" 389; *lmš'l* "to ask" 931; *lmymr* "to say" 239, 240, 271, 834. Examples with *w* from YFG: *mprwš* "to distinguish" 74_{37}; *mqṭw'* "to cut" 82_{32}; *mš'wl* "to ask" 158_{27}; *my'wl* "to enter" 170_{16}; *mšḥwq* "to crush" $172_{6,7}$; *mlbwš* "to dress" 181_{19}; *lmnhwg* "to act" 182_{5}; *m'bwr* "to cross" 204_{7}; *mswq* "to ascend" 232_{42}; *lmtpws* "to grasp" 257_{16}. With a suffixed pronoun: *mqṭwlnyh* "to kill him" 17_{6}. Without *w*: *m'bd* "to do" 159_{1} (see above); *mišmɛ'* "to hear" 104_{20} (so vocalized); *mzbyn* "to purchase" 138_{19} is probably = *mzbwn*. YFE: *mykwl* "to eat" 16. Examples from a Yerushalmi fragment (not from the Geniza) published by Freimann in *Tarbiz*, VI (1935): *mymwr* "to say" 60_{16}, 62_{17}; but *mymr* 62_{27}. Without *w*: *msbnh* "to take it" YFE 17. Examples from YFL: *mymwr* "to say" 256, 257, 258; *mymr* "to say" 258, 260 (4×), 270, 276, 278, 282 (*mymr* also occurs in V). *mymr* occurs also in FPT, e.g. 56 (Ex 19:12).

The Imperfect and Imperative of the pĕ'al: Since the infinitive was apparently influenced by the imperfect, it is not surprising to find most of the imperfect and imperative forms pronounced with [*ō*], even when the

third radical is a guttural. This tendency stands out also in [illegible] somewhat less in Ma'lūla[66].

Imperfect: *dyz'wp* "that he should be angry" 689; *dyšbwn* "that he should purchase" 362 (so also in the basic text); *yswq* "he will go up" 952; *nswq* "I will go up" 296.

Imperative: *swq* "go up!"[67] 520 (in the basic text *sq*); *zrw'* [illegible] *ḥkwm* "know!" 1045; *lbwš* "dress!" 197 (2×); *gzwr* "decree!" [illegible] *šbwq* "leave alone!" 389; *mlwg* "pluck!" 447; *swq* "go up!" (f. sg.) [illegible] Without *w*: *qṭ'* "cut off" 444 (in the basic text *qtw'*; Is this a *pa'el* form?); *th'* "claim" 452 (2×; in the basic text *tbw'*).

Examples from FPT: *wĕyiš'ol* "and he will ask" 10 (Gen 32:1[illegible]); *yqrwb* "he will approach" 56 (Ex 19:12); *ytqwp* "he will be strong" [illegible] (Ex 19:22); from YFG: *yswq* "he will go up" 184_{21}; *zbwn* "purchase" 194_6; *smwk* "rely!" 194_{24}. The form *ytbw'* "he will claim" occurs in a Palestinian writ, *Tarbiz*, IX (1938), p. 196.

qåṭōl forms: This form is very widespread both in the Western and in the Eastern Aramaic dialects. It first appears in BA: *kårōz* "herald" (Dan 3:4) and is found in Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew (also in Arabic). It is used as a *nomen agentis*, and as such, its meaning is close to that of the participle. In fact, in SA this form actually displaced the participle[68]. In Ms. V the situation is similar. Examples: *nṭwr hwwyn'* "I was guarding" 917; *'nh 'rys 'bwr 'nh... 'nh bśr 'bwr* "I am a transient tenant farmer ...I am transient flesh" 665; *lyt twrh ngwšh* (so according to the photograph; not *ngyšh*) *'d dbrth b'wṭh* "no cow is a gorer until her calf (lit. daughter) is a kicker" 952–953; *dyhwwn qywmyn* "that they should be standing" 689; *hwwy zrw' hwwy nṣwb* "Be a seeder! Be a planter!" 702 (This reading was placed in the basic text); *pkwr tr'yyh* "an uprooter of the gates" 753. Apparently also the following: *mh d't mlwg mlwg* "whatever you pluck, pluck!" 447. Perhaps also the following: *qbw' hy' ṣrykh* "she needs a talisman" 448; *šry nhwg* "he began acting" 307; *yrwth* "the inheritor" 599 (This reading was placed in the basic text); *rdwpyn* "pursuers" 1002.

65 Schulthess, *Grammatik*, p. 61, 2c.

66 Spitaler, *Ma'lūla*, p. 145.

67 The passage quoted refers to a woman, and the expected form should have been *swqy*; however, since in Ma'lūla the final *y* of the 2 f. sg. imperfect and imperative forms has disappeared, it may be assumed that this was the case here also and that there is no error. Cf. the following example from "Palestinian Halachic Practices" [illegible] *l'ntth qrwb ḥlwṣ* "And they say to the woman; 'Approach, remove (his shoe)'" (*Tarbiz*, I/1 (1930), p. 100).

68 Cowley, *SL*, p. xxxviii.

Used as a noun: *drwš* (II) "preacher" 1262; *qywmyyh* "the inhabitants (lit. the standing ones)" 292; *hmwqh* "the strangler" 916.

Pronouns

'ynwn — hynwn "they (m.)": In Ms. V the form with *h* occurs very often (and so mostly in CPA)[69]: *hynwn* 184 (basic text: *'ynwn*), 196, 236, 266 (basic text: *'ynwn*), 327, 374, 378, 446, 639, 663, 711, 916, 930, 951, 1257, etc.; *'ynwn* 273, 301, 307, 360, 813 (2×), 917. In the Noaran inscription[70] (l. 8): *dhynwn*. In the el-Ḥammeh inscription[71] (l. 1): *hnnwn*. The feminine form *hynyn* also occurs: 813 (2×), 1241; but *'nyn* 937 (2×).

'ylyk — 'ylyn "those": *'ylyk* 650 (basic text: *'ylyn*). In CPA the form is *hlyk*[72] (and see Dalman, *Grammatik*, pp. 112 § 6; 113); *lhdk ym'* "to that sea" 34 (so also in the basic text. Is this *h–* + BA *dek*?).

2 f.sg. possessive pronoun: This is generally written with *y*: *'ymyk* (basic text: *'ymk*) "with you" 812, 838; *d'ymyk* (basic text: *d'mk*) "of your mother" 815; *bryk* "your son" 247; *lyk* (basic text: *lk*) "to you" 247 (2×), 947 (2×), 1232; *mrglytyk* "your pearl" 948; *ksyrytyk* "your . . ." 948; *qwltyk* "your pitcher" 1232; *bbytyk* "in your house" *ibid.*; etc.

2 f.sg. independent pronoun: V seems to be the only manuscript which has preserved the Ancient Aramaic form *'ty* "you" 1182 (2×). Dalman (*Grammatik*, p. 106) records only *'t* (*'t* also occurs in V, p. 247.) In CPA the form *'ty* is also preserved.

Particles

gb "towards": When used with singular suffixed pronouns, the singular form is employed; however, with plural suffixed pronouns and in the construct state, the plural form is generally employed. E.g.: *gbk* "towards you (sg.)," but *gbykm* "towards you (pl.)"; *gby* "towards." This is not the case in V. Here the singular form is found also before plural suffixed pronouns and in the construct state. Examples: *lgb* "towards" 1095, 1178; *lgb rbynw* "towards our teacher (i.e. R. Judah, the Prince)" 306, 761; *gb dydy* "towards me" 1143; *gbn* "towards us" 817; *gbhwn* "towards them" 648, 930. The following plural forms also occur: *lgby rbynw*

69 Schulthess, *Grammatik*, p. 32.

70 *SY*, p. 109, *s.v. nw'rn*.

71 *SY*, p. 46, *s.v. ḥmt gdr*. Incidentally, there is no reason to assume an error here. The *n* of *hnwn –'nwn* is doubled, and this is occasionally indicated in Rabbinic sources by writing the letter twice. Cf. Epstein, *MNM*, p. 1258.

72 Schulthess, *Grammatik*, p. 33.

"towards our teacher" 761; *lgby R. ly'zr* "towards R. Liézer" 160; *gbykwn* "towards you (pl.)" 302. Incidentally, *lgby* "towards me" 690 was "corrected" in the basic text to *lgb'y*, the Eastern Aramaic form. It should however be pointed out that in Ma'lūla most prepositions with suffixed plural pronouns — including *gb* — occur in the plural[73]. Examples from YFG: *gbwn* "towards them" 6_{11}; *'l gb* "on top of" 16_{5}; however, *gby* "towards" 10_{24}.

bhdy "with": This preposition occurs three times in BR (338 (2×), 361) and only in V. This is quite puzzling since this is an Eastern Aramaic word *par excellence*.[a] Did V preserve a form which disappeared from the other Western dialects? I suspect not. This is probably a conscious borrowing from the Babylonian Talmud.

lyyd "to": This preposition occurs in SA, CPA, and — as a survival — in Mishnaic Hebrew. Here it occurs in the meaning "to": *lyydn* "to us" 301 (in the basic text *lhk'* "to here"); *lydyy 'yytth* "(if) you bring (lit. brought) it to me" 262.

hlk — 'lk "hither": *hlk* 730, 840; similarly in YFG.

The tendency of GA to append *n* to indeclinable words ending in an open syllable is well known[74]. Therefore, the following forms should be preferred: *sgyn* (basic text: *sgy*) "many" 817, 1241; *kmn* "many more times" 1128; *twbn* "again" 1183 (5×); however, *sgy* "many" 306; *kmh* "how many" 172.

Dalman[75] was of the opinion that the adverbial ending *-yt* found extensively in Syriac and CPA (See Schulthess, *LS*) did not exist in GA. Therefore, he considered the forms *ṭb'yt*, *ṭbyt* "well" to be corruptions. Ms. V refutes this opinion: *ṭb'yt* 894, 1126; however, *ṭb'wt* 302.

Miscellanea

In the story of Emperor Diocletian and the Rabbis, the Emperor concludes with the following words: *l' tbsw l' brwmyy z'wr wl' bgwlyyr z'wr* "Do not make fun of a low Roman or even of a low *galearius* (common soldier)" 690. As is well known, the form of the 3 m.pl. imperfect in GA and in the other Western Aramaic dialects — as well as in ancient Aramaic — was *yqṭlwn*. In this respect, I do not believe that I have found any errors in V. Then why do we find here *tbsw* (and not *tbswn*)? It

73 Spitaler, *Ma'lūla*, p. 53.
74 Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 102.[b]
75 *Grammatik*, p. 211 (top).

should, however, be recalled that in Ancient Aramaic the negative imperative appears in the shortened form *yqṭlw*, e.g. *'al yištannō* "let (thy countenance) not be changed" (Dan 5:10). (The negative particle *'l* of BA[76] does not occur in GA.) Could this example be a survival of this usage? It should be remembered that the words are put in the mouth of an emperor, who would most likely speak "good" Aramaic! Nevertheless, this assumption is somewhat far-fetched, since the time interval between these two dialects is nearly a thousand years, and there are no examples in either Palmyrene or Nabatean, dialects closer to Ancient Aramaic.[a]

Vocabulary

Besides the various words mentioned above, two additional words found only in V should be mentioned: 1) *qyṭrn* (= *'ṭrn*)[77] "a type of resin" 1021. Krauss in *AAC* already commented on this word, though in an unclear manner. This form occurs in Arabic (from which it was borrowed into other languages). This spelling raises the problem of the relationship between *qyṭrn* and *'ṭrn*; 2) *h'tnḥt'* "the pausal stop" 342. If this is not a later addition, this seems to be the earliest source for this word.

V also helps clarify a word in Biblical Hebrew. On p. 1232, we read about R. Ḥananya b. Ḥachinai who studied under R. Akiba for thirteen years in Bĕne Bĕrak and "did not know what had been going on in his home" (*wl' hwh yd' mh bbyytyh*). How then did he recognize his family when he returned to his city? *'zlh*[78] *lmlyth šm' qlhn dmlwwtyh 'mrn btw šlḥkynyy mlyy qwltyk wswq lyk* "He went to the *mlyth* and heard the voice of the women water-drawers saying: 'Daughter of Ḥachinai? Fill your pitcher and go up!' " It is clear that the *mlyth* is "the place of water-drawing." This word is identical with *ml't* in Song 5:12: *'ynyw kywnym 'l 'pyqy mym rwḥṣwt bḥlb ywšbwt 'l ml't* "His eyes are like doves beside the water-brooks, washed with milk, set by the watering-place." Since no parallel of *ml 't* has been known[79] until now, its meaning was doubtful. This story clarifies both its meaning and its etymology.

76 B–L, p. 89.

77 See: S. Fraenkel, *Die aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen*, Leiden 1886, p. 150.

78 *'zlh* is not an error and should not be corrected to *'zl*. This is a *sandhi*-writing for *'zl lh*; cf. *'zyl lyh* "he goes away" 502; *dyyzl lh* "that he should go away" 1145; etc. This usage is common in GA in other intransitive verbs and became the rule in Ma'lūla.

79 See: Gesenius-Buhl, *s.v. ml't*.

"*Kětib* and *Qĕre*"

A singular feature of V should be pointed out here, viz. a type of "*kětib* and *qĕre*." This applies to III *y* verbs which are etymologically III-' verbs. In these instances, the orthography on the one hand is historic — preserving the ', and on the other, phonetic — representing the correct pronunciation as a III–*y* form. Thus, apparent mixed forms result: *bry'y* "my creator" 556 (2×) is actually [**bårayy*]. The historic ' is written in the III–*y* form. Similarly for the root *qrh* (= *qr'*) "to call"; *qry'yn* "they (m.pl.) call" 686, is actually [*qårayīn*], a III–*y* form with an added '. So also according to the photograph *qr'yyn* "they call" 763. In the Hebrew text: *mṣ'ynw* (i.e. *mṣynw*) "we found" 383, 477; *mwṣ'yn* "they (m.pl.) take out" 513. The original form *mwṣy'yn* became **mwṣyn*. Also *mṣ'wy* "common" (lit. found) 1265 (2×); *ns'wy* "married" 609.

Various Corrections

Clarification of the method in which corrections were introduced into the text is apt to be of help both linguistically — as shown above — and exegetically. Consider the following examples: *nykwl dydyh wnyyḥwk 'lwy* "Let us eat of his (food) and mock him" 699. V's reading *nyyḥwk* perplexed me, since I was unable to explain the form. Moreover, it is very doubtful whether this root existed in GA. A glance at the photograph dispelled my doubts. It was clear that the original word had been tampered with and erased. From the remnants of the letters it is certain that the original reading was *ndḥwk*. The root *dḥk* "to mock" is used in GA alongside *gḥk*[80] (cf. e.g. BR, p. 48).[a] One of the readers of Ms. V who did not recall the root *dḥk* "corrected" the *d* to *yy* giving *nyyḥwk*. The "corrector" was familiar with the form *ḥyyk* "laugh" — common in the Babylonian Talmud and in TO, and — from a grammatical point of view — created a mixed form.

With regard to the "corrections," the story on pp. 931–932 is very instructive: *qm nsb skyn' whḥzyr*(!) *lh hdsqryn*(!) "He stood up, took the knife and returned the saucer to her." The fact that the whole story is related in Aramaic, but two words in the middle are given in Hebrew, is a clear indication of a "corrected" text. The text in V is *whzr lh dyysqrh* in Aramaic. A copyist who understood *ḥzr* as a *pĕ'al*-stem "corrected" it to the *hiph'il hḥzyr*. (In several mss. the Babylonian Aramaic form *whdr*

80 Dissimilation?

a (could) However, in GA[81], as well as in SA[82], *hzr* in the *pa"el* stem means "to return, give back." The following rule holds true: A Hebrew word in an Aramaic context indicates that the text has been tampered with.

This rule is the key to the solution of another unclear text. On p. 1144, a story is related about an innkeeper in the southern region of Palestine who used to conspire with brigands to rob his guests. He would awaken his guests in the middle of the night with the following statement: *qwmw pwqw ḥws dlwyth 'ny 'brh*. Albeck correctly understood the passage as meaning "Get up and go outside! The caravan is passing by (and join it)" (ḥws = ḥwṣ). Several mss. read *'bdh* "makes (f.sg.)" which is a corruption. According to Albeck the superfluous word *'ny* (*'n*) "I" was added here. But *'ny* — *'n*' occurs in V and L which read *'brh* (in V once: *'bdh*)! How did this word find its way into these manuscripts? More importantly, how is it possible that an accurate manuscript like V should suddenly insert a Hebrew form *'ny* into an Aramaic context in which the other manuscripts give Aramaic *'n*'? It is clear that the scribe of V corrected something which was incomprehensible to him. But what was the reading before him?

The matter is clarified by the reading in *Midrash Haggadol* (ed. Margulies), pp. 743–744, and in the *Sepher Ha-Maasiyoth* (ed. Gaster), p. 127. The reading there is *dlwy'th 'y'brh*. This reading is comprehensible. As S. Lieberman has shown[83], the form *'y* + the participle occurs in the Palestinian Talmud, e.g. *'yḥṭy* "he sins" (= *'y ḥṭy*); *'y'br* "he passes by" (= *'y 'br*), etc. The scribe of Ms. V did not understand the meaning of *'y'brh*, added a *n*, and divided the word into two giving *'ny 'brh*. However, on p. 1238, where there was no possibility of error he correctly copied: *'y'ny* (= *'y 'ny*)[84].

Place Names

This is not the place to deal with the particular forms of place names in V. In the main, these involve orthographical problems. I will deal here with only a few of the names in order to substantiate my opinion regarding the special nature of V.

81 In *Halachoth Kezuboth, attributed to R. Yehudai Gaon* (ed. M. Margulies), Jerusalem 1942 (Hebrew), p. 24, the editor quotes examples of *ḥzr* = *hḥzyr*; e.g. *ḥwzryn 'wth shwrh* "they return that merchandise," etc. Is this because the Aramaic *pa"el*-form was thought to be a *pe'al*-form?

82 So Cowley, *SI.*, Glossary, *s.v.* *'zr* (= *ḥzr*).

83 *Tarbiz*, IV (1933), p. 293. I intend to deal with this phenomenon elsewhere.

84 See Lieberman, *ibid.*; *idem*, *Tarbiz*, III (1932), p. 453.

ṣypwryn "Sepphoris," the Palestinian form of the name (in TB: *ṣypwry*), is an instructive example.[a] This spelling occurs on the following pages: 48, 257, 305, 388, 1136, 1261, etc. The form *ṣypwrym* — a form found also in other Rabbinic sources — occurs once (p. 1234). In the other mss. the Babylonian form *ṣypwry* is found[85].

The form *'spnyyh* "Spain" is found on pp. 38, 446, 1271, instead of the regular *'spmyh*. This form — paralleling Greek Ἱσπανία — is practically non-existent in other Rabbinic sources[86]. This seems to be the only source for the spellings *q'pdwqyyh, qpdwqyyh, qpdwqyy'* 785 Καππαδοκία with *d*, instead *qpwṭqyy'* with *ṭ*, as in other Rabbinic sources. Also, this seems to be the only source in which the spelling *ywrdnws* (= *ywrdnys*?) 29 Ἰορδάνης, the Greek form of "Jordan," is found[87]. Alongside the Palestinian form *qysryn* "Caesarea," e.g. 194, 557, the Babylonian form *qysry* also occurs (p. 343), perhaps because this city is not in Galilee.

Exegetical Remarks

There is undoubtedly still room for new explanations of passages in BR based on the text of V. This holds true mainly for readings not listed in the *variae lectionis*. But even readings which are listed may be utilized further for this purpose. Although this is the task of scholars dealing in Midrash, it seems appropriate to illustrate this statement by a few examples:

1) P. 830: *wyḥr 'p y'qb . . . rbnn ddrwmh bšm R. 'lksndry wrbn' bšm R. 'b' br khn'* " 'And Jacob's anger was kindled' (Gen 30:2) — The Rabbis of the southern region (of Palestine) in the name of R. Alexandri and *rbn'* in the name of R. Abba b. Kahana." This is the reading in the basic text, and Theodor is uncertain of the identity of *rbn'*. On p. 691: *rbnn ddrwmh bšm R. 'lksndry wrḥbh bšm R. A.b.K.* Here also there is no plausible explanation for *rḥbh*. In both cases the reading *dhbh* is given for V in the *variae lectionis*. But read according to the photograph: *rbnn ddrwmh bšm R. 'lksndry wdhkh bšm R. 'b' br khn'* "The Rabbis of the southern region in the name of R. Alexandri and *of here* (i.e. Galilee) in

85 Strangely enough this was not noted in *SY*, even though the difference was already pointed out by Z. Frankel, *Mĕvo ha-Yĕrušalmi*, Breslau 1870, p. 3b. See at length: S. Klein, *MS*, pp. 47, 48.

86 S. Krauss, *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch, und Targum*, Berlin 1898–99, II, p. 91.

87 *Ibid.*, p. 559.

the name of R. Abba b. Kahana." The explicit reading *rbnn dhk'* "Rabbis of here" is in fact found in *Midrash Haggadol*[88].

2) P. 190: *'mr R.'l'zr bR.šm'wn nwḥ lw l'dm lgdl lygywn šlzytym bglyl wl' lgdl rnwq 'ḥd b'rṣ yśr'l* "R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon said: 'It is easier for a man to raise a *lygywn* of olives in Galilee than to raise a child in Palestine.'" This is the reading in the basic text, but the reading in V is *rygywn*. This reading raises an interesting problem: Is this the Latin word *regio* "district"? Or perhaps the *r* is the result of dissimilation: *lgdl lygywn* > *lgdl rygywn* "to raise a legion"? Both alternatives seem possible. On the one hand the word *regio* does not seem to be found in Rabbinic sources, and at first glance, it is difficult to understand how a Latin word entered the Midrash here.[a] On the other hand, according to Dr. Shalit, with whom I discussed this problem, this was a technical term of the Roman administration used also in Palestine. The continuation of the story fits this interpretation.

3) P. 336: *wḥm hw' 'by kn'n 'bwy dpḥth* " 'And Ham was the father of Canaan' (Gen 8:18) — The father of the degraded person." This is also V's reading according to the critical apparatus. But according to the photograph, the reading is clearly: *dpḥmh* "of the charcoal-one." Even though the *editio princeps* on p. 1277 reads: *šm'wn wlwy 'ḥym 'ḥym dpḥt'* " 'Simeon and Levi are brothers' (Gen 49:5) — Brothers of degradation,"[89] compare the following passage, p. 341: *yh' 'wtw h'yš k'wr wmpwḥm* "May that man (i.e. Ham) be ugly and black as charcoal." The Midrash (*ibid.*) further on employs the root *pḥm* in describing Ham. (Is this a play words: *pḥm — ḥm*?)

4) P. 999: *bt my zhb sr'dyn hwwn wmn d'trwn 'mrwn mhw dhb' wksp'* " 'The daughter of Me-zahab' (Gen 36:39) — They were smiths, and when they became rich they said: "What is gold and silver?" It seems to me that V's reading is closer to the truth: *ṣr'ryn* (= *sr'dyn*?) *hwwn mn d'thwn 'mryn mh hw' dhb' wmh hw' ksp'* "They were smiths and *by their knowledge* they would decide what is gold and what is silver," i.e. they were experts in this. If the reading in Pseudo-Jonathan to this verse re-

88 *Midrash Haggadol, Genesis* (ed. M. Margulies), Jerusalem 1947 (Hebrew), p. 527. The compiler knew chapters of *BR* which are found only in Ms. V (cf. *BR*, Introduction, p. 108). M. Margulies pointed out the following parallel passages to me: *rbnn dhk' 'w rbnn drwmy'* "The Rabbis from here or the Rabbis of Darom (the southern region)" (Y. Ber. III, 7; M. Kat. III, 5). See also: W. Bacher, *Tradition und Tradenten*, Leipzig 1914, p. 604 (pointed out to me by Prof. Albeck).

89 See the commentary, p. 336, and Albeck's detailed discussion, p. 1277.

flects the version in the basic text, then this is further proof for the well-known fact that this Targum absorbed many late additions[90].

5) P. 1103: *wy'mr pr'h . . . whl'dyk l' yrym 'yš 't ydw klydrym w't rglw klydrym* " 'Pharaoh said (to Joseph): . . . Without your consent no man shall lift up his hand' (Gen 41:44) — *klydrym*; 'and his foot' (*ib.*) — *klydrym*." Cf. Albeck's discussion and his attempt to explain this word. Perhaps the explanation lies in V's reading which, however, I am unable to explain completely: *'t ydw klydrym w't rglw hldrym* " 'his hand' — *klydrym*; 'his foot' — couriers." The word *hldr* "runner, courier" (e.g. *BR*, p. 932) fits the text quoted here perfectly: *'t rglw* "his foot." But compare Albeck's opinion and explanations which do not agree with my proposed explanation.

6) P. 1260: *kbs byyn lbšw šhw' mḥbr lhn dbry twrh* " 'He washes his garments in wine' (Gen 49:11) — He clarifies the words of the Torah for them."[91] The Midrash here explains the root *kbs*, which also the Pĕšitta translates here by the root *ḥwr*. The Midrashic explanation is built upon this equivalence.

7) P. 666: *b'w bny yšm"l ly'wr 'l yśr'l* "The sons of Ismael came to dispute with Israel." Ms. V reads: *l'wr 'm yśr'l*. Correct accordingly Ms. V on p. 1268: *l'wr 'mhm* (instead of: *l'dr*) "to dispute with them." That this is the correct version is shown by the following passage from Elephantine[92]: *wlqblh dyn 'wry 'mh* "and in accordance with it (i.e. the deed) contest with him."

Postscript to Ms. V

The foregoing study of Ms. V gives food for thought on the methods of publishing texts of the Aggadic (and other) Midrashim, on which I feel bound to comment here. Firstly, criteria should be laid down by which it can be decided which is the best text, i.e. the one closest to the archetype. It was no accident that Prof. Albeck concluded — without using linguistic criteria — that Ms. V is the best manuscript with regard to its readings. Dr. J. Schirmann and Prof. U. Cassuto came to the same conclusion as to the nature of the manuscript after a paleographical examina-

90 R. Judah al-Barceloni in *Sefer ha-'Ittim*, p. 258: *wtrgwm 'r'y ysr'l šys bw mspr hgdwt šh hwsyfw hzqyn sthn mḥmtn* "And as for the Palestinian Targum which has haggadic additions — the cantors added them by themselves" (quoted by S. Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, p. 223).

91 This is definitely the meaning in Ms. V. The use of *hbr* (*pi"el*) "to compose (a book)" originated in Medieval Hebrew and is a borrowing from Arabic.

92 Cowley, *AP*, p. 22, l. 21.

now. The above study has proved this fact with regard to the language. It seems to me that the language of the text should serve as the primary criterion. However, not the Hebrew of the text since we still do not have a true set of criteria for the Hebrew of the Midrash. The Hebrew of the Midrashim was not a spoken language and, therefore, its nature has to be first determined (Biblical, Mishnaic, new elements, etc.). Conversely, the proposed criterion is apt to further this clarification.

In my opinion the Aramaic language of the Midrashim should serve as the fundamental criterion. For this much is clear: If the language of the Aramaic portions is corrupt, then the text has undoubtedly been tampered with and has not come down to us in its original form. It may, therefore, be concluded that the Hebrew portions are also suspect. This is not the case when the Aramaic is in order. In this case it may be assumed that the other portions were also preserved in their original form.

As a result, when the editor of a Midrashic text himself is not a linguist, it is advisable that he should be assisted by a linguist who is an expert in Western Aramaic. This applies both to the choice of the text to be used as the basic text and to assistance throughout the work. The text which is recognized to be the reliable text should be printed as the basic text even though it may be incomplete. With regard to fragments of reliable texts (i.e. Geniza fragments),[a] if the basic text is not a reliable text it is advisable that these be printed in its place, or at least be printed as an appendix to the edition. In any case, it is not proper, that a reliable text, albeit fragmentary, should be "buried" in the *variae lectionis* to be forgotten there (cf. *infra*).

With regard to the method of publication, in my opinion a solution should be found to indicate the blank spaces in the manuscript. Anyone who has read a manuscript knows that occasionally a scribe leaves blank spaces. (This does not refer to the space left between two sections.) These blank spaces are to be found mostly in the middle of a section when the scribe was unable to read the word in the manuscript before him. Sometimes the scribe places dots in the blank space, and sometimes not. Occasionally, the reader can restore the omission from another manuscript. In any event, it is clear that it is extremely important to point out the fact that there is a blank space in the manuscript as well as its length. The reason for this is that the text is certainly defective at this point[93]. A special sign should be employed to indicate blank spaces and their length (from three letters on). The lack of a sign of this type deceives the

93 See, e.g. Epstein, *MNM*, p. 1211.

reader as well as the editor of the text in his work. Consider the following example on p. 268: *'mr R. ḥnynh 'yn ttyyh* "R. Hanina said: / /" The last two words are unclear and the editor is unsure of the meaning. He finally says: "And in Ms. V the words *'yn ttyyh* do not appear at all - But in Ms. V there is a blank space which is the length of these two words. The conclusion is that these words were in the text from which the scribe of Ms. V copied, but since they were incomprehensible to him, he skipped over them and left a blank space. Therefore, this is not proof against the reading (cf. *infra*).

The editors acted wisely in using a special sign to indicate a correction in Ms. V (=V^0). But it seems to me that there should be an additional sign. To judge from the script of the corrections, *it appears possible* that there were two correctors. The first corrected in a square script in the text itself, and the second, mainly in the margins in Rashi script. The second corrector added to and sometimes completed the text. Both tend towards normalization. For example, the first corrected *dybr* "(Divine) word" 1237 to *dybwr*. He apparently corrected *ḥbšwbh* "Sunday" once to *ḥdbšwbh* (above, p. 23). From this it seems that the terms that he corrected were not completely understood by him. Nevertheless, sometimes there are actual corrections. The second corrector who wrote in Rashi script was even more extreme. He added on the margin *š'wh* "wax" 1136, for *š'bh* in the text. (This is perhaps meant as a gloss.) Therefore, it is perhaps worthwhile to employ sigla to indicate — as far as it is possible to determine — who made the correction, and perhaps also a siglum to indicate whether the correction was made between the lines or in the margin.

An additional suggestion: I mentioned above the blank spaces. Sometimes it appears that part of the blank was filled in afterwards, perhaps by a later hand, since the script, even though square, is not exactly on the line. This seems to be the case with the word *b'mtw* "in Amathous" 387 (followed by a blank space). Today it is possible to do even more. Many times we encounter erased words, and it is often very important to clarify the nature of the erased word. As has been shown here, the erased word is often the ancient form which was replaced by a newer form. Editors of texts should be able to employ infra-red photographs to clarify such erasures.

A portion of the above-mentioned problems — if not all of them — could be solved if photographs of reliable texts could be published along with the printed text.[a] Since it is certainly too much to ask of an editor to prepare a special study of each line, such photographs would give the

reader the opportunity to clarify all those points which I have mentioned above (blank spaces, additions, etc.). Consider a case in point: Prof. J.N. Epstein asked me to check the following reading in V: *bhdh byzrh dkpr hyṭyyh* "In that *byzrh* of Kefar Ḥiṭṭayya" 728. The late Prof. S. Klein had explained *byzrh* as equalling *by zrh* "guest house".[94] On first reading it seemed to me that this was the reading in V; however, on second reading I noticed that it could be read *bhdh*, and the first *bhdh* was slightly erased. The matter still needs further clarification.[a]

The time has perhaps come to collect photographs of reliable texts in our scientific institutions, at least in the form of microfilms. This should probably be done in the framework of a registration of the Hebrew manuscripts in libraries throughout the world[95].

One final note: I have quoted a large number of new forms from Ms. V, YFG, etc. The grammatical study of GA has been nill in the last few decades. In the field of Talmudic lexicography, however, a new book, *Additamenta ad Librum Aruch Completum*, was published years after the publication of the above-mentioned material. If it is not surprising that the verbal forms listed above are not given in this work, it certainly is very strange that new forms of words as well as new words found in Ms. V and FPT are not given (except for *qyṭrn*). We may ask ourselves: For whom then are critical editions of basic texts edited?

3. CLARIFICATION OF GRAMMATICAL POINTS IN GALILEAN ARAMAIC

4. The Ending -ayīn (byt šryyn, šryy "Beth Shearim," etc.)

In BA the m.pl. participle of the III–*y* verbs ends in *–ayin*, e.g. *bānayīn* "building" (Ezra 5:4), etc[1]. The parallel form in the other verbal classes is *–īn*, viz. *qāṭĕlīn* "killing." Except for the III–*y* verbs, the form in GA is the same as in BA. The same applies to nouns: *malkīn* "kings" (not *malkē*) with final *n*, as the reliable texts show[2]. In the ordinary texts *n* is often missing, since in TA the m.pl. participle has the form *qṭly*. The copyists of the Palestinian Talmud were influenced by the dialect which they knew better, viz. TA. Except for a few occurrences of the form *'mry* "they say," the form *qṭly* is hardly ever found in reliable texts; however, this form seems to be just a graphic device. In Ms. V a dot above the *y* (indicating an abbreviation) reveals the intention of the copyist. This dot is found, e.g. 452, 455; but without a dot, e.g. 598, 856. Similarly: *nḥty* "they go down" 303; in a nominal form: *dkry* "males" 306 (so according to the photograph. It is not always possible to come to a definite conclusion in such cases from the photograph); however, *sbyn* "old men" 510, according to the photograph (and not *sby*). In both CPA and SA the form is *qṭlyn*. TO, where the form *qṭly* is occasionally found, is not admissible here as evidence for the reasons given above (§ 1). In Ma'lūla word-final *n* has disappeared only in the noun, but not in the participle or in the adjective[3].

1 This form has not been explained. The explanation given in B–L, pp. 64y; 233g, is not convincing. Perhaps there is an analogy here to the 2 f. sg. imperfect. In the strong verb the form is *tiqṭĕlīn*, but in the III–*y* form **tiṣbayīn* (〈**tiṣbayn*). Through the relation *tiqṭĕlīn* (imperfect): *qāṭĕlīn* = *tiṣbayīn* (participle): X, the form *ṣābayīn* came into being. (True, the 2 f.sg. forms of the perfect and imperfect do not occur in BA, but it is obvious that in speech this must have been one of the most common forms.)

2 *Contra* Dalman, *Grammatik*, pp. 102; 190 191. On the transcriptions which he quotes, see *infra*.

3 Spitaler, *Ma'lūla*, pp. 30; 104–105. Spitaler's reliance on Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 102, with regard to GA, is therefore incorrect; see further on.

Though apocopation of word-final *n* is not to be found in the word *hmyy* in the participle in GA, it is very common in the active participles of the III-*y* verbs. The following examples will prove this point. Ms. V — Without *n*: *h'yy* "wanting, asking" 112, 81[4], 117[9], 118[6], *hmyy* "seeing" 1126; *mslwy* "praying" 45; *mš'lyy* "questioning" 55, *h'y* (probably = *h'yy*) "asking" 1136. Also a nominal form: *gly* "biblical verses" 970. With *n*: *h'yyn* "asking" 1183; *mdrwn* "hurling" 886 from "studying diligently" 1240; *mtyyn* "bringing" 251, 253; *mwqyyn* "hanging" 870, 871; *mmgyyn* "making sore" 396; *dmksyyn* "which are covered" 300; *qryyn* "calling" 161, 380, 681, 868 (2×). *qr'yn* 543. (See infra p. 48 "*Kĕith* and *Qĕre*". Add the following example: *qr'yyn* 694; *mryyn* "hearing" 328. With one *y*: *štyn* "drinking" 689. The form *hkn* (= *hākān*) "crying" also occurs (See *infra*).

This phenomenon is quite evident in YFG: *h'yy* "asking" 41_{5}, 87_{16}, 196_{6}, 201_{25}, 264_{9}, 271_{9}; *mdmyy* "comparing" $100_{9,16}$, 158_{3}, $159_{...}$ *hwwyy* "being" 152_{3}; *mwdyy* "admitting" 56_{41}, $59_{3,7}$, $60_{3,7}$, 84_{18}, $[94_{21}]$, 218_{32}, 245_{25}; *ḥmyy* "seeing" 23_{2}, $100_{9,16}$, 139_{5}, 149_{23}, 158_{3}, $159_{...}$, 207_{22}, 273_{6}; *myytyy* "bringing" 220_{1}; *'nyy* "answering" 207_{23}, $277_{...}$ "hurrying" $283_{5,7}$; *šṭyy* "jesting" 210_{6}; *šryy* "permitting" $201_{...}$, $277_{...}$ "learning" 216_{8}; *mṣlwy* (read probably *mṣlyy*) "praying" 74_{28}. There are only a few examples with word-final *n*: *'tyyn* "coming" 216_{21}, $[...]$ "asking" 16_{11}, 298_{10}; *mtb'yn* "being asked" 218_{27}; *ḥmyyn* "seeing" 149_{9}, 249_{11}, *ḥmyn* 249_{14}; *l'yn* "studying diligently" 133_{5}; *štyn* "drinking" 196_{17}. The form *b'yyn 'nh* 9_{15} is apparently a corruption for *b'y 'nh* "I ask" (= *bā'yan*, i.e. with a suffixed pronoun?). It should be pointed out that in dual nouns *n* is kept: *kyl'yyn* "Kilayim" 94_{21}; *ydyyn* "hands" 101_{28}; *'lpyyn* "two thousand" 101_{24}; *rḥyyn* "(upper and lower) mill-stones" 114_{12}. All of these are Hebrew words in a Hebrew text. Even though I am not sure that I have recorded all the examples, nevertheless, it seems that the forms with word-final *n* are an insignificant minority in YFG.

YH — *h'yy* "asking" $132_{4,5}$; *mwdyy* "admitting" 131_{22}, *mwdy* $[...]$. YH — *qryy* "Biblical verses" 263_{24}; but *h'yyn* "asking" $250_{...}$. A Hebrew dual form: *ydyyn* "hands" 274_{7}. GS — *h'yy* "asking" $[...]$, *mwdyy* "admitting" 393 (2×); *ḥmyy* "seeing" 393, 500, *mṣlwy* "praying" 526, *qryy* "calling" 526. A dual form in a Hebrew text *qrw'yn* "proclamations"[4]

4 On this word see my article in *Tarbiz* XVI (1945), p. 45 ff. and especially p. 46 (last).

Nishu forms, e.g. *gwnlyyn* "Goths" *BR*, p. 1241 (Ms. V), *gwlyyn* YFG 257_{16} etc. do not belong here since their ending is not *-ayn* but *-åyin*.

Thus, Dalman[5] was not exact in concluding that GA was different (from TO) in that it preserved the ending *-ayīn*, e.g. *glyyn* "revealing." This conclusion is especially strange since Schlesinger[6] had already correctly established this fact in 1889, when he wrote that as against the other verbal classes, apocopation of *n* occurs in the III-*y* class. (It was his opinion that this was only a graphic phenomenon, i.e. *qryy* = *qryy(n)* "calling.") The facts should also have been quite clear to Dalman, since in this respect the picture is not much different in the regular texts[7]. Apparently neither Schlesinger nor Dalman recognized this phenomenon, since they considered it to be just a small part of the general phenomenon, i.e. the possibility of the apocopation of *n* in every form of *qṭlyn*. However, as was shown above, in light of the reliable texts this view is incorrect.

These forms point to a different solution: The forms *bånayīn*, etc., developed from **bånayn* (as **zayt* > *zayīt* "olive", **yadaym* > *yádayīm* "hands" in Hebrew). It must be assumed that in GA — as in Ma'lūla[8] — the diphthong caused the apocopation of word-final *n* (see *infra*). With regard to the forms with word-final *n*, it may *a priori* be assumed that this is just a phenomenon of graphic analogy to the other plural forms; however, see *infra*.

In YFG there are some very interesting vocalized forms, e.g. *qårayyn*(!) "reading" 262_{21}. The vocalizer considered the form to be *qåray*(!) as was shown above (p. 44). Note also *bĕʿḳyy* "asking" (= *bḳʿay*) 78_{12}. The vocalizer considered the form to be passive. (We prefer the form *båʿay*, the active participle. There is no need, however, to assume that there is a mistake here; cf. the Hebrew forms *såbūr* "thinking," etc.) The following vocalizations are at first glance puzzling: *ḥamyīn* (= *ḥåmyīn*) "seeing" 104_{22}; *baʿyī* (= *båʿyī*) "asking" 106_{21} (an active form!). One tends to think that the vocalizer erred and grafted onto this verbal class the vocalization of the strong verb (i.e. *qåṭĕlīn*). But since in Ma'lūla the

5 *Grammatik*, p. 340.

6 M. Schlesinger, *Das aramäische Verbum im Jerusalemischen Talmud*, Berlin 1889, p. 62.

7 See in detail: Spitaler, *Ma'lūla*, p. 90, § 7c, where several features dealt with throughout this study are collected.

8 Interestingly, in the dialect of Ṭūr 'Abdīn word-final *n* is kept in the participle only in the III-*y* forms, i.e. the exact opposite of GA. See: S. Siegel, *Laut- und Formenlehre des neuaramäischen Dialekts des Ṭûr 'Abdîn*, Hannover 1924, p. 63.

plural was formed anew on the analogy of the singular form of the strong verb[9], we may assume that this process had already begun in the [illegible] thus, this vocalization, reflects a correct linguistic tradition. Instead of *hwwn dbbw mymr* "they wanted to say" YFG 65_{34}, read *hwwn dbbw mymr* (so also Venice edition). Nevertheless, I am not sure that the situation is not more complicated.

In light of the facts quoted above, we might expect to find the same phenomenon in other situations where the same combination occurs, i.e. the diphthong *ay* followed by *n*. This is in fact so. Firstly, in the 2 f sg imperfect form: According to the other Aramaic dialects — the form is not found in BA — the original form was, e.g. **tiṣbayn* "you will want." Dalman[10], in fact, states that the ending in this form is *ayn* or *aṭy*. Besides *tṣbyyn*, the form *thṭyy* "you will sin" also occurs, e.g. *l' thṭyy* "do not sin!" GS, p. 404; *thṭy ib.*, p. 403.

The same applies to nouns. As was noted, *infra* § 2C, the forms *tryy — try*, *trtyy — trty* exist alongside *tryyn*, *trtyyn*. Here also, the same assumption stated with regard to the verb is valid. Alongside *myn — myyn* "water," the spelling *myy* also occurs,[a] e.g. Ms. V 359; YFG 127_{22}, 115_{1}, *dĕmayye* "of water" *ib.* 107_{25}. In this last example, a later vocalizer apparently grafted a Babylonian form onto the word[11]. But in FPT *mayīn*, *mayyīn* 25, 30 (The dot is not a vowel point.); *myyh* "the water" 32 (Gen 9:15). The name of the letter *z* in Ms. V, p. 683, is written *zyn* (so also in Syriac). The above examples are sufficient to prove the correctness of the rule which was assumed. Interestingly enough, this rule is still active today in Ma'lūla[12], though not in the above-mentioned forms since they no longer exist, but in other circumstances. I do not want to claim that this is a continuation of the rule which applied to CA. It may or may not be, but it is a definite parallel.

This rule may serve as a key to the solution of the form of place names such as *byt š'ryyn — byt šryy* "Beth Shearim." As is well known, the form in the Babylonian Talmud is *byt š'rym*, but in the Palestinian

9 Spitaler, *Ma'lūla*, p. 165.

10 *Grammatik*, p. 339; examples, *ibid.*, p. 346.

11 The form *mwy* listed by Dalman, *ibid.*, p. 91 — to the extent that it exists in reliable texts — is simply *mwhy* "its water," e.g. *mwy dmbwl'* "the water of the Deluge" *BR*, Ms. V, p. 296; *mwy dmbwlh* FPT 30 (Gen 7:7), 32 (Gen 9:11); but *mwy* (Gen 7:10). The form: *dl' ytn mwyy* "that he should not give water" Y Ḥull. 3a seems to be an error. Correct accordingly also: Th. Noldeke, *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, Strassburg 1910, pp. 167 168.

12 Spitaler, *Ma'lula*, p. 30e.

Talmud the form is *byt šryyn* — *šryn*, *byt šryy* — *šry*. It is clear that we [illegible] *bēt ša'ărayīm*, a dual form. The ' was lost in pronunciation [illegible]. As a result of our rule, *byt šryyn* should become *byt* [illegible]. The same applies to other place names mentioned in the Talmud and in the Midrashim which have the same form as for, viz. names with a dual ending, e.g. *snbryy* "Sennabris" 126[14], [illegible] in Galilee seems to have the same form. Similarly *kpr* "Kefar Semai" in the Palestinian Talmud is known in the Babylonian Talmud as *kpr svm'y*[16]. Also *kpr mnwry* "Kefar Mnwry" is vocalized by Klein *mĕnoray* (from what source?)[17]. This is perhaps the ending in the name *nhr gynyy* "the rivulet Ginai." (This name is transcribed by Josephus *Γινάη* (= Ginay?))[18] and also in the name *nhr* [illegible] "the rivulet Ḥabrai."[19]

The same applies to place names in Palestine which are written in the Babylonian Talmud with the ending *–'y* (= *–yy* in the Palestinian Talmud), e.g. *kpr brq'y* "Kefar Barqai."[20] I was of the opinion that the same applied to *kpr 'wtny* "Kefar Avthanai" on the border of Palestine, written *'wtn'y* in the Mishnah of the Babylonian Talmud and in the Mishnah[21]. However, not only do we find the transcription *καπαρκοτνεῖ* at this period *ει* = *ι*)[22] in the map of Ptolemeus (2nd cent. C.E.) and "Kaparkotani" in Poitinger's map, etc.[23], which point to the form *'otnī*, but there is evidence for this form also from Rabbinic sources[24]. Thus,

13 On the form of the name, see: Klein *EG*, p. 214, n. 4; *SY*, *s.v.*; Avi-Yonah, *GHEY*, p. 133. See also *infra*, n. 15! The form, therefore, is *bēt ša'ărayīm*.

14 *SY*, *s.v.* Avi-Yonah, *GHEY*, p. 139. The vocalization, therefore, is *ṣanbĕray*; cf. Klein, *EG*, p. 44; etc.

15 *SY*, *s.v.*; and especially, Klein, *EG*, pp. 130, 131; Avi-Yonah, *GHEY*, p. 142. The form is probably *bēray*.

16 *SY*, *s.v.*; Klein, *EG*, p. 63; Avi-Yonah, *GHEY*, p. 146.

17 *EG*, p. 63; however, the text is uncertain. See *SY*, *s.v.*

18 *SY*, *s.v.*; Avi-Yonah, *GHEY*, p. 125. The transcription refers to the place.

19 *SY*, *s.v.*; Klein, *EG*, p. 126. The possibility that *–yy* represents the *nisba*-ending *–ay*, i.e. "the river which belongs to (is near to) Ginna, Ginnaim," etc., should be taken into consideration. Similarly, "the river of Ḥabra," and the like. However, a determined form *ḥbry'*, *gynyy'* would be preferable in such cases.

20 Klein, *MS*, p. 6, n. 6.

21 On this place, see *SY*, *s.v.*; for a discussion of the form, see: Dalman, *SS*, p. 221. Correct S. 176, to: 173; PJB, to: PJB, p. 35.

22 See, especially: Dalman, *op. cit.*, and Avi-Yonah, *GHEY*, p. 144. *Ibid.*, n. 17, quoted by Avi-Yonah as well as in Hartmann's article, which unfortunately I am unable to check.

23 Mishnah Git. I, 5; VII, 7. In the Mishnah of TY: *'wtny*; Cambridge Ms. (ed.

even though *byt šryy*, for example, is occasionally spelled *byt* [illegible] transcriptions on the one hand, and the consistent spelling with [illegible] (and without ') on the other hand, suffice to prove that the form [illegible] probably an abbreviation of the type *kpr ḥmy* — *kpr ḥumh* "K[illegible] Hanania." The name *'otnt* occurs in I Chron 26:7. The name *kpr pr[illegible]* is doubtful[25], since the variants *kpr pgš*, *kpr prš* are attested[26].

Characteristically enough, while *byt šryy* — *šryyn* is transcribed in the Babylonian Talmud in the form *byt š'rym*, *kpr brq'y* "Kefar Barkai" remained unchanged, since its etymology from *brqyyn* was [illegible] unknown. The reason for this is understandable: Beth Shearim was a Jewish center for some time, and its name reached the Diaspora not only in written documents or as part of the Halakhic tradition, but also as a living form. With regard to names in the Palestinian Talmud and the Aggadic Midrashim ending in *y*, we may suspect that the ending *-y* presents *-ay*. But as the example of *kpr 'tny* shows, there is no certainty in the matter.

Finally, the following question should be clarified: Does the assumption that *ayn* > *ay* lead necessarily to the conclusion that this is the only possibility? What about the forms *b'yyn*, *qryyn* etc.? These cases may be easily explained by assuming that there was a graphic analogy to the regular plural form (if we exclude the possibility of the new form **qartā* as noted above, p. 45). But what about *tryyn* instead of *tryy*? In this case, it is difficult to think of any graphic analogy. The situation is further complicated when we compare the forms *tryyn*, *trtyn*, *trtn* especially in FPT. Why do we nearly always find *tryyn* but always *tartē(y)n*? A plausible answer, mainly for the instances in FPT, is the following: *tryyn*, *trtn* always appear before nouns, e.g. *bětartēn bntk* "for your two daughters" 8 (Gen 31:41); *tartēn m'wtyn* "two hundred" 10 (2 ×) (Gen 32:15); *tartēn nšwy* "his two wives" 10 (*ibid.* 23); *trtyn 'mhtyh* "his two maidservants" 10 (*ibid.*), 42 (Gen 31:33); *trtyn bnn* "two daughters" 14 (Gen

Lowe): *'tny*; Ms. Kaufmann: *'otnī* (so vocalized); Ms. Parma: *'tn* (in the first case vocalized: *'otnây*; the second: *'otnī*; oral communication of Mr. H. Yalon). The spelling *'tny* is found in the Mishnah of the Munich Ms. of the Talmud, and in R. Menahem ha-Meiri's commentary to the Talmud, *Beth Habehira*, *Gittin* (ed. A. Sofer-Enger), *'tny* is written with one *y* in all its occurrences in the Tosephta, apparently in all the manuscripts. The listing in *SY* is again incomplete. For example, the occurrences in Mishnah Git. VII, 7 is not given. Also lacking: Tos. Bek. VII, 3 (ed. Zuckermandel, p. 541$_{37}$); Para X, 2 (638$_{32}$) [These references are taken from Dalman *op. cit.*] *'tny* is also found in Y. B.Meṣ. 11c.

25 Avi-Yonah, *GHLY*, p. 128.

26 *SY*, [illegible] p. 90, n. 1

29:16): *trtyn ḥlyn* "two loaves" 42 (Lev 23:17). The form *tryyn* occurs when no noun follows (for references, see above, p. 26). When followed by a noun, the form is *tryn*, e.g. *tryn lywḥy* "two tablets" 26 (Deut 5:19); *tryn ʾḥwy* "his two brothers" 32 (Gen 9:22); cf. also *try ʿśr* "twelve" 50 (Lev 22:27). Since *trayin* is generally written with *yy*, it may be assumed that the vocalization in the above-mentioned cases is *trēn*. But we also find: *tryyn ywmyn* "two days" 2 (Ex 21:21); *tryyn ʿśrwnyn* "two tenths" 55 (Num 28:20), 61 (*ibid.* 28). In Ms. V the forms *tryyn*, *tryy* are also found when no noun follows (references *supra*, p. 26), and mostly *trtyyn*, *trtyy*; however, we also find *trtyyn nšyn* "two women" 327; *trtyyn nynwh* "two Nineveh's" 427. Mainly, *tryn*, *trtyn*, *trtn* occur before nouns, but we do find *trtn* used independently (p. 959).

Nothing can be learnt of the geographic distribution of this linguistic law from place names such as *ṣnbryy*, etc. Such names give evidence only of the language of the writer. But — if the tradition is correct — the Babylonian form *brqʾy* is quite instructive.

At first glance one might think that this law applied also to Palmyrene, since the Palmyrene Tariff reads: *ʿynn trtn dy m*[*y*] "two fountains of wa[ter]."[27] However, not only is *my* restored[28], but it is now clear that this restoration is incorrect. A Palmyrene inscription[29] reads: *lḥm wmn lmh yśbʿ* "He will not be satisfied with bread and water." Thus the correct restoration in the Palmyrene Tariff is *m*[*n*].

With regard to the Jerusalem region, the form *Γεθσημανεί* is apparently Hebrew: *gt šmny*[*m*] "olive press." In Aramaic, the transcription is more difficult to explain. Therefore, this may not be adduced as proof of the apocopation of *n* in the ending *-ayn*. The name *Βηθφαγή*—in Jewish sources *byt pʾgy* — is even more doubtful. According to Dalman[31], this derives from *pgyn* "unripened dates"; however, a derivation from *pagan* is also possible. In any event, nothing definite can be established. Perhaps this is a case of apocopation of word-final *n* (or *m*) of the plural. (After all, what do we know of the Jerusalem dialect?)

27 *CIS, Pars Secunda, Tomus* III, Paris 1926, no. 3913, pagina 2, l. 58.

28 Based on Mandaic; see *ibid.* With regard to the Mandaic form, see: Nöldeke, *Neue Beiträge*, p. 168.

29 *CIS*, II/3, no. 4218.

30 Dalman, *Grammatik*, pp. 190–191; cf. *supra*, n. 2.

31 Dalman, *SS*, p. 253. The fact that in Rabbinic sources there is an ʾ after the *p* supports the contention that ʾ was employed as a *mater lectionis*, mainly in foreign words. Incidentally, there is only one *γ* (cf. Dalman, *ibid.*, n. 29). It is interesting to note that *kpr pʾgy* (*SY*, *s.v.*) apparently goes back to *πηγή* "fountain."

There seems, however, to be no hint of this rule in SA, CPA, or FPT. Examples from FPT: *'ašuqin* "oppressed" 28 (Deut 28:29); *ʿāyin* "miserable" 29 (Gen 30:23); *mašqin* "waiting" 41 (Gen 11:27); *ḥayin* "living" 60 (Ex 20:15); but *ʾāmmin* 58 (Ex 20:2; ref. supra, p. 45 *gārin*). A nominal form: *tāmin* (= *tāmayin*) "blind" 48 (Gen 38:27). This open up interesting possibilities for establishing the provenance of these latter two dialects. It confirms the theory that the provenance of CPA was far from Galilee, but close to SA, i.e. it was a dialect of the inhabitants of Judea. With regard to FPT, this is one of the points of contact between it and CPA, as opposed to GA. (There are other points of contact.) This points to its geographic provenance as being perhaps the coastal or southern region. However, other factors may be involved.

What is the nature of the ending found in place names such as *byt šryyn — šryy*? At first glance, there is no doubt that this is the "dual" ending[32], since the plural form of the participle of all verbal classes — except the III–*y* class — is *–in* (e.g. *qāṭĕlin*). But what does the "dual" have to do with place names? As is well known, the number of place names in Biblical Hebrew with the "dual" ending is significant, e.g. *šaʿărayim, qarnayim*. From the Rabbinic period *'yblyym*[33].[a] This "dual" ending is considered to be the archaic locative ending[34].

Nevertheless, there is still room for doubt, since it seems that this "dual-locative" **ending parallels the plural:** ***'yblym — 'yblyym*** **is today** *ʿIblin*; *gynyy* is to day *Jannīn* with the Aramaic *plural* ending. This can, of course, be explained: **It is well-known how endings change from one** period to the next and from one source to another. For example, the name *ḥprsym — 'pryym, Αφαία* and also *'prw*[35] has three different endings. The first is a "dual," the second a determined plural (or dual), and the third an ending common to place names. The shift from a "dual" to a plural ending could have easily occurred. In spite of this, the phenomenon poses the following question: Do we actually have here a plural and not a dual ending? It should be pointed out that while the Aramaic

32 In detail on this question, see B. Mazar (Maisler), *Beth She'arim*, Vol. I: The Catacombs 1–4 (Jerusalem 1973), p. 11 (Hebrew). His suggestion — that [illegible] of the name acted as if it were a participle of a III–*y* root — is very clever, because of [illegible] such as *yaḥzeq, bāṭeḥ, bōṭeḥ*, etc.; the second alternative seems to me [illegible] "dual" seems preferable.

33 S.F. [illegible] *Das Lautsystem des samaritan. Sprachtypus*, Vienna 1916, I, p. 34 H. Bauer, *Das Lautsystem des samaritan. Sprachtypus*, Vienna 1916, I, p. 88 ff.; Barth, *op. cit.*, §§ 83, n. 3, p. 512, n. 3; Brockelmann, *GVG*, I, p. 395, § 270

35 Dalman, *SS*, p. 219. The form *'prw* occurs in *BR*, Mss. V, p. 1256.

plural form of *melek* "king" is *malkīn*, the determined plural form is *malkayyā*. The most plausible explanation of this form is that it derives from the dual and not from the plural[36]! Could it be that Palestinian Aramaic moved a step further in this direction, i.e. the speakers began *to use the dual* instead of the plural form *also for the absolute form*?

There appear to be indications of this form also in the literary sources. In TT: *wpyrwkyym* "dry ears of corn" 52 (Lev 23:14); *qylwpyym ḥwwryym* "peeled white streaks" 39 (Gen 30:37). In *BR*: *'ytryym* "places" 699 (according to Ms. L) (*'srṭyym*(?) "companies" 1067 (2×)); *kryryym* (= *kdyryym*) "'as the (Temple-) sheds'" 607 (quote from Mishnah Nedarim I, 3). The same reading is found in the Lowe edition (Cambridge Ms.) of the Mishnah (*kdydyym*!) and is vocalized in the Kaufmann Ms. *kĕdirayīm*. It may be assumed that since the Mishnah is quoting a vow which was made in the vernacular, its language is Aramaic. The complete phrase is *k'ymrh* (*k'ymr'*) *kdyryym* " 'as the lamb' (or) 'as the (Temple-) sheds'." *'ymrh* is certainly Aramaic. The ending *m* in *dyryym* does not prove the opposite. Because of the popular nature of vows, it is possible that a form was preserved here which in regular Aramaic was very rare.

Finally, do the Greek transcriptions *Βεσάρα* and [*Καπ*]*αρασιμά* (*kpr smyy*)[37] represent a singular noun in the determined state, or was *ay* at the end of a word likely to contract to *ā*[38]? (Cf. *supra*, p. 46: *bĕ'å* (= *b'yy*) YFG 65_{34}).

B. *The Construction mn + the Participle*[a]

The problem of the vocalization of the form *m'wmd* "standing" was raised by H. Yalon[39]. He pointed out that different Jewish communities pronounced this form in various ways, e.g. the Sephardic pronunciation is *me'ōmed* the Ashkenzic *mĕ'ummåd* and the Yemenite *me'omĕd*. Yalon himself explained the form [40], supporting his explanation with an Aramaic passage from *BR*, Chap. 98:11 (p. 1262): *'mrth mn q'ym tzky lmymyth mn ytyb* "You have said it standing. May you be worthy to say it sitting." Thus, we see from here that the Yemenite tradition is the correct one and the word should be pronounced *me'omed*[41]. A study

36 B L., p. 263 ff.
37 Avi-Yonah, *GHEY*, p. 146. The name itself is doubtful; see *SY*, *s.v.*
38 See Dalman, *Grammatik*, pp. 90d; 91f.
39 *Tarbiz*, 1/1 (1930), p. 154, n. 8; *ibid.*, 1/2, pp. 193, n. 4.
40 *Qunțresim le-'inyane ha-Lašon ha-'ivrit*, I, pp. 79–80.
41 The spellings *my'wmyd*, *mywšyb* found in R. Jehudai Gaon, *Halachot Pesuqot* (ed. S. Sasoon), Jerusalem 1950, p. 173 (Hebrew), strengthen this view.

of reliable texts shows that this construction is found to a great extent in GA. Moreover, this construction always has a specific syntactic function. The original form — *mn* + the participle — was preserved in only a few places, and most of them are in reliable texts only (cf. *infra*, nos. 1–4 from Ms. V). In most cases, the construction was corrupted in various ways which in themselves are instructive regarding the methods used in "correcting" the texts. Some "new grammatical forms" were also created. In general, *mn* + the participle became *mqṭl*. This form is similar to the Aramaic *pĕ'al*-infinitive (see above § 2C). Sometimes the *m* was then separated from the word and became an independent *mh* "what" (no. 4). Sometimes the spelling was *myqṭl* and from this an independent *my* "who" was separated (nos. 13, 15, etc.). Under the influence of TA, the *m* was changed to *ky* (nos. 5, 17, etc.). If in spite of everything the *mn* survived, it was changed to *m'n* "who" (no. 6), or, under the influence of the preterite, to *mn d–* "since" (nos. 1, 4, etc.). Sometimes it was completely eliminated (nos. 5, 7, etc.), or — under the influence of TA and TO — was changed to *kd* "when" (nos. 5, 6, 8, etc.). *my* was even changed to *'y* "if" (no. 20). Sometimes even the verb was corrected (no. 11). All these forms have led to innumerable grammatical mistakes. As a result the situation needs to be clarified by a large number of examples.

For what purpose is this construction used? From the following examples its purpose is clear: It serves as a predicative. In Biblical Hebrew, the participle serves this purpose, e.g. *yṣ'w nṣbym* "they went out standing" (Num 16:27); *'św 't 'šryhm mk'ysym 't YHWH* "they have made their Asherim angering the Lord" (I Kings 14:15); etc.[42] In Syriac, the construction *kad* + the participle is used, e.g. *'ĕnå . . . kad mɛṭḥammat* "he answered while angry"; *dabbaḥ lam napšeh lĕšede kad nåḥet* "he offered himself to demons while descending."[43]

In the Babylonian Talmud this is generally expressed by the particle *ky*, e.g. *'yyl ṭyy' twty brkyh ky rkyb gml'* "The Arab passed under his knees riding on a camel" (B. Bath. 74a)[44]. In Mandaic, the particles *kd*, *'l d–* are used in a different context[45]. At Dura-Europos, the construction *kd* + the participle is found in an Aramaic inscription on a fresco: *mšh kd npq mn mṣrym wbz' y'm'* "Moses, while going out of Egypt

42 P. Joüon, *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique*, Rome 1923, p. 178b.

43 Th. Nöldeke, *Syrische Grammatik*[2], Leipzig 1898, p. 200.

44 M. Schlesinger, *Satzlehre der aramäischen Sprache des babylonischen Talmuds*, Leipzig 1928, p. 242, ff.; cf. *infra*.

and splitting the sea"; *šmw'l kd mšḥ dwyd* "Samuel while annointing David."[46]

The following are examples from GA:

1. *BR*, chap. 78 (pp. 931–932), according to Ms. V: *R. šm'wn bn lqyš dhy lmt'l ḥlmh drḥynw . . . mn ytyb* (so also Ms. G; the other mss. add: *'l*) *gbyh 'll hdh* (read: *ḥdh*) *'yth* "R. Simeon b. Lakish went up to pay his respects to R. Judah the Prince. While being seated next to him a woman came."

2. *BR*, ibid. (p. 917), according to Ms. V: *'m(r) lh mn hn hw' 'ty 'm(r) lh mn d'thwn dḥyw'th dhynyn mdy'n mn ṭ'ynyn kwrsyyh* "He said to him: 'From where does it (i.e. the river of fire) come?' He said to him: 'From the perspiration of the animals which perspire while carrying his throne'."

3. *BR*, chap. 75 (pp. 728–729), according to Ms. V: *'wbd' hwh bḥdh sy'h dn'ryṭwn . . . ḥd mynhwn mn dmyk* (Ms. L: *mydmk*; Mss. PK: *mdmk*) "It happened among a group of servants. When one of them was dying..."

4. *BR*, chap. 33 (pp. 301–302), according to Ms. V, in the story of Alexander the Great: *mn ytyb gbyyhw* (read: *gbyyhwn*) "While he was seated next to them." The reading in the basic text is *mh ytyb* (corrupted from *mytyb*), and apparently so also in the other mss. Ms. P: *wmh dyytyb*; Ms. O: *wmdytyb*.

5. *BR*, chap. 33 (p. 300), according to Ms. V: *R. yhšw' bn lwy slq lrwmy . . . wmmhlk bšwq' ḥm' ḥd mskn* "R. Joshua b. Levi travelled to Rome . . . While walking in the market place, he saw a poor man." This reading occurs only in Ms. V (and O[1]). The other mss. read either *wmhlk* or *wky mhlk*, *wkd mhlk*.

6. *BR*, chap. 92 (pp. 1138–1139), according to Ms. V: *zbdyy br lwy wR. yhwš' bn lwy wR. ywsy br pyyṭrws tltyhwn 'mrw* (read: *'mrwn*) *tlṯh qryyn mdmkyn* "Zabdai b. Levi and R. Joshua b. Levi and R. Yose b. Petros, the three of them said three verses while they were dying." Ms. S: *mn dmky*; Ms. G: *mn dmkyn*. The other mss. "corrected" the reading to *ḥd dmkyn*. In the basic text: *m'n*(!) *dmkyn*.

7. *BR*, chap. 78 (p. 931), according to Ms. V: *mṯḥmy mḥzr wydyh psyḥ* "He is seen on returning and his hand is outstretched" (cf. the commentary). The *m* disappeared from all the other mss. of *BR*. It was preserved, however, in the later Midrashic works *Leqaḥ Ṭob* and *Sheḥer Ṭob* (see the commentary, *ibid.*).

8. *BR*, chap. 62 (pp. 671–672), according to Ms. V, is an interesting example: [*bs't sylwqn šlṣdyqym HQBH mr'h lhm mtn škr*] *R. 'bhw*

46. Sakenik, *op. cit.* (p. 24, n. 43), pp. 76, 77, 104.

mdmk[47] *'brwn qwmwy tlt 'śr nhryn* ... "At the time of the death of the righteous, the Holy One blessed be He, shows them their reward. Thirteen rivers (of balsam) passed by R. Abahu while he was dying." Thus explicitely: *bš't sylwqn* "at the time of their death." In the basic text *kd dmk*, and apparently so in the other mss. (including Ms. V^2). So *ibid.*, p. 672 (only in Ms.V): *zbdyy . . . mydmkyn*. In all the other mss.: *kd*.

9. *BR*, chap. 96 (p. 1240), according to Ms. V: *'wlh br yšm"l nḥt ltmn mdmk šwry bky* "Ulla b. Ishmael emigrated there (i.e. to Babylonia). When he was dying he began to cry."

10. *BR*, chap. 6 (p. 48) according to Ms. V (The *variae lectionis* are very bad for this section.): *dlmh R. šmw'l 'ḥwy dR. pynḥs br ḥm' mn* (corrected to *hwh*) *dmk bṣypwryn whwwn ḥbryyh ytbyn gbyh* "A story: When R. Samuel, the brother of R. Phineas, was dying in Sepphoris, the colleagues were sitting beside him." Ms. V^2 also reads: *mn*.

I have brought all these examples from *Bereshit Rabba* since we can see from the critical apparatus how this construction was "corrected" in all the manuscripts, including Ms. L and Ms. V^2, to the point where it is doubtful whether we could have recognized the construction from these other manuscripts.

11. Y. Ber. V, 9a, l. 39: *R. šm'wn bn lqyš mnhgw b'wryyth sgyn hwwh npq lbr mn tḥwmh dšwbth whw' l' yd'* "R. Simeon b. Lakish while thinking about the teachings of the Torah (i.e. while deep in study) would go out of the Sabbath limit unwittingly." YFG 17_{12} and Ms. Vat. Ebr. 133 read: *myhgy*. It is clear that the correct reading is *mn hgy*.

Ibid.: *R. ywdn byR. yšm"l mnhgyh* (YFG 18_1: *mhgy*; Ms. Vat. 133: *myhgy*) *b'wryyth sgyn hwwt gwlth šr'h mnh* "When R. Judah b. R. Ishmael was very deep in study, his cloak would fall off him." Clearly, *mnhgyh* should be: *mn hgy*. YFG 18_2 (not in the *editio princeps*) reads: *R. ly'zr byR. šm'wn mhgy b'wryyth sgyn hwwt gwlth šr'h mnh*.

12. Y. Shek. V, 49b, according to YFG 132_{17}: *nḥwm 'yš gm zw hyh mwlyk drwn lbyt ḥmyw pg' bw mwky šḥyn 'ḥd 'm(r) lyh zky 'ymy mn m' d'yt gbn* (read: *gbk*) *'m(r) lyh myḥzr* "Naḥum of Gimzo was bringing a present to his father-in-law's house. A man afflicted with boils came up to him (and) said to him: 'Give me alms from what you have on you.' He said: 'On returning (I will give you)'."

13. Y. R. Hash. I, 57b, according to YFG 153_{16}: *'(mr) R. yhwš' bn lwy 'n' 'ryb l'lyn d'zlyn llmwdyn dlyt ḥd mnhwn m'yt m'yzyl* "R. Joshua

47 Y. Ab. Zar. 42c, l. 20 (also Ms. Leyden): *my dmk*.

b. Levi said: I am responsible for those who go to study, that not one of them will die on going." Ed. pr.: *my 'zyl.*

14. Particularly interesting with regard to the use of this construction is the following example from the "Abridged Legends of the Palestinian Talmud." GiS, p. 427: *rby hwh mmmy try mnyyn . . . my dmk* (ed. pr.: *mddmk*, approximately: **middâmek*) *pqyd w'(mr) lbryh . . . l' t'bd kn . . . mn ddmk b' bryh mmmtyh* . . . "R. Judah the Prince would make two appointments (i.e. no more than two at one time). *When he was dying* he commanded his son: 'Do not act so.' *After he died*, his son wanted to appoint . . . " This version is, of course, exact. The first construction is *mn* + the participle, whereas the second is *mn d–* "after," "since" + the perfect of the verb.

15. The following example, Y. Ab. Zar. III, 42c, 1.1, is quite instructive (cf. *supra*, no. 8): *kd dmk R. nḥwm br sym'y ḥpwn 'yqwnt' mḥṣln . . . kd dmk rby 'ḥ' 'ytḥmy kwkb' bṭyhr' kd dmk R. ḥnn 'ytkpwn 'ndrty'* "When R. Naḥum died, they covered the picture with mats . . . When R. Aḥa died, a star appeared at noon. When R. Ḥanan died, the statues were turned over." All of these events occurred *after their deaths*; therefore, the construction *kd* + *dmk* "when he died" is used. When the event occurred while they were dying, the construction *my* (=*mn*) + the participle was used (*ibid.*, l. 20): *R. 'bhw my dmk 'brwn qwmwy 13 nhryn d'prsmwn 'mr lwn kl 'ylyn lm'n . . . zbdyy br lyw'y*(!) *wrby ywsy br pyṭrs wrby yhwš' bn lwy 'mryn tlt' pswqyn my dmkyn* "When R. Abahu was dying, thirteen rivers of balsam passed (by him). He said to them: 'For whom are all these?' . . . Zabdai b. Levi, R. Yose b. Petrus, and R. Joshua b. Levi spoke three biblical verses while they were dying."

Ibid., l. 33: *kd dmk rby ys' npl qsyṭwlyn dṭybryh* "When R. Yasa died, the castle of Tiberias fell in." This is again an event which occurred after his death. But *ibid.*, l. 36: *rbn ywḥnn bn zk'y my dmk 'mr pnw hbyt mm ḥtwm'h* "When R. Joḥanan b. Zakkai was dying, he said: 'Empty out the house because of the uncleanliness (resulting from the presence of a corpse in the house)'." Note also that in every case of *kd* + *dmk*, the predicate precedes the subject; however, in the construction *mn* + the participle, the subject precedes the verb. These examples prove that in this construction the participle was inflected according to number (See *infra*, no. 18).

16. Y. Ber. V, 9a, l. 33: *R. 'bwn 'l qwmwy mlkwt' ky npyq hpk qdl* "R. Abun entered before the (Roman) government. On going out he turned his back (on them)." But in Ms. Vat. Ebr. 133: *my npq*. In YFG 17_5, the text is slightly "corrected:" *mdnpq*(!), as in several other cases (e.g. no. 1).

17. Wayyikra Rabba, chap. 34 (pp. 793–794)[47a]: *dyhm' R. ywhnn wrbh lgy' wbnw bmwsby bhdyn dymwsy' dtbry' wpq' bhwn hd mskn 'm(r) lhwn (ed. pr.: 'm(rwn) lyh mybryn* (Ms. Vat. 32: *my npqyn*; ed. pr.: *ky npqyn*) *'nn zkyn hk mybryn 'šk ḥwnyh mryt 'mry hw'yl wl' 'tplnn byh bhyyy mpl byh bmwtw my mshyn lyh 'šk ḥwn ḥdh kys dḥnš m'h dynryn tly bsw'yh* "A story: R. Johanan and Resh Lakish went down to the public bath of Tiberias and a poor man came up to them. He said to them: 'Give me alms.' They said to him: 'When we return we will give you alms.' On returning they found him dead. They said: 'Since we did not attend to him during his lifetime, let us attend to him in his death.' On washing him, they found a purse with five hundred dinars hung on his neck."

In light of this and other examples, I am very much in doubt whether the word *ky* existed at all in GA sources! It does not occur in any other Western Aramaic dialect. It probably derives from *my* which the copyists changed to *ky* under the influence of TA[48].

18. Y. B. Kam. IX, 7a, l. 24: *khdh 'ytt drby b' br ḥnh my dmk' 'mrh 'hn qydwš' drbty* "Like the wife of R. Abba b. Ḥana who said when she was dying: 'This is my daughter's betrothal gift'." Dalman (*Grammatik*, p. 234) translates: "als sie entschlafen war." Thus she spoke after her death! Similarly, he misunderstood the form: *mnpqyn* "on their going out" (Y. Taan. IV, 69a), *ibid.*: "nachdem sie herausgegangen waren."

19. The next example, Y. Pes. IV, 31b, is also interesting. (The text is quoted in the main according to GS, p. 443): *bywmwy dR. mn' hwwt nwmyrh bṣypwryn whwh bnyhwn dṣypwryy mškwnyn gbwn m'ty mzl lwn* (ed. pr.: *md't'y myzl*) *'pyq R. mn' krwz* . . . "In the days of R. Mana there was a division of troops in Sepphoris, and the sons of the inhabitants of Sepphoris were held as pledges by them. When they were about to go out, R. Mana issued a proclamation . . .". At first glance, the singular form is puzzling, since as we have seen, the participle is inflected for gender and number. But in the parallel biblical construction, the situation is similar. Alternatively, perhaps: *'ty* = *'tyy*.

47a I would like to thank Dr. M. Margulies, who is preparing a critical edition of Wayyikra Rabbah, for permitting me to use the manuscript of this edition.

48 It cannot be contended that this is a Hebrew survival, since it is not found in Mishnaic literature. The word in Eastern Aramaic (i.e. in TA) is apparently a loanword from Akkadian.

20 Y. Kil. IX, 32c, l. 29: *'sl' nḥwr' bnh 'ydmt* (read: *mydmt*, cf. *mn dmr lh*) "Ulla was an emigrant from Palestine. When he was dying (i.e. in Babylonia) he began to cry." Similarly, *ibid.*, l. 32: *d'mr glwtr (i.e. in Babylonia) hw' bkh' 'ydmt lyh b'rs' 'm(y)* . . . "When R. Meir was dying in Babylonia he said . . ." Read: *mydmt*[49], in spite of the fact that the reading *'ydmt* is found also in Y. Keth. XII, 35b, and in Yalkut Machiri on Psalms 24:2. But *Midrash Haggadol* (ed. Margulies), p. 809 reads: *kd(y) lkh my dmt*[50]. The above examples are sufficient to prove the "correction." This example is further proof of the extent to which the regular editions have been corrupted.

21 The Rabbis even grafted this construction onto a biblical verse for exegetical purposes: *'lwpynw mswblym* "May our cattle be heavy with young" (Ps 144:14) was interpreted as follows ("Abridged Legends of the Talmud," GS, p. 394): *R. ywḥnn '(mr) 'lwpynw mĕsōbĕlīm* (so vocalized) *bš'h šhgdwlym swblym 't hqṭnym 'yn prṣ* "R. Yoḥanan said: *'lwpynw mswblym* (Ps 144:14) — When the great take care of the small 'there is no mischance' (*ibid.*)."

These examples suffice to show the wide distribution of *mn* (*my*, *m–*) + the participle, its meaning, its uses, etc. Additional examples: YFG 210_{18}, 230_{34}, 294_{10}; GS 419, 421, 422, etc. One more example should be pointed out: *ḥsl mydrš* "he stopped preaching" YFG 232_{27}, since this construction may have begun with verbs of this type. I have not found this construction in FPT. However, cf. *'rwm 'yk 'rq hw'* "because he was a fugitive" 41 (Gen. 31:20: *ky bwrḥ hw'* and not **mn 'rq*).

This construction is widespread in CPA. Examples: *w'mrnn lhwn mn dḥlyn dl' yqṭwlwn ytn* "Being afraid we said to them not to kill us"[51]; *mn ṭ'y' 'štkḥt hk'* "In (my) wandering I found myself here"[52]; *mn mhymnyn* "believing"[53]; *mn ytyb bgw qlytk* "while you are sitting in your cell[54]." These examples show that there is agreement also in gender and number[55],

49 Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 258, brings this and other examples to prove that in GA as in Syriac (and similarly in Arabic) an auxiliary verb can come before the perfect. These proofs — as well as the others brought there — are, thus invalid. I intend to deal with this elsewhere.

50 G. Allon, *Eretz Israel*, I (1951), p. 130, n. 1 (Hebrew).

51 Schulthess, *Grammatik*, Chrestomathie, p. 121, l. 15.

52 *Ibid.*, p. 124, ll. 5–6.

53 *Ibid.*, p. 126, l. 21.

54 *Ibid.*, p. 128, l. 7.

55 Schulthess was aware of this phenomenon; cf. *ibid.*, p. 90, § 3, and his explanation there.

as is generally the case in GA. In CPA, the construction *hyk d-* [illegible] apparently also possible. Examples: *hyk dhw' rhy'* "as he was reclining at the table)" (Mat 26:7); *whyk dhmwn 'klyn* "And as they were eating [illegible] 21). The situation is, however, more complicated than it appears at first on the surface (but not with regard to the subject). Sometimes the participle appears alone. This construction is also found in SA (oral communication from Dr. Z. Ben-Ḥayyim).[a] At least in reliable texts, the construction *kd* + the participle never occurs alongside *mn* + the participle.

Interestingly enough, this construction does not occur in TO which, however, has *kd* + the participle, e.g. *'ry 'ḥwt . . . kd 'ḥyl' lʿl* "I shall go down to Sheol mourning" (Gen 37:35); so also Ex 14:9. (So Pseudo-Jonathan in both cases). Again this is important with regard to the origin of TO and the nature of Pseudo-Jonathan.

We have thus found another feature common to Western Aramaic: *mn* + the participle as a predicative. Therefore, this is important for the question of whether this construction parallels *mn yṣyb yd' 'nh* "I know with certainty" (Dan 2:8) in BA. Even though this possibility seems far-fetched, it must still be taken into consideration.

Finally, one puzzling point should be mentioned. It was stated that the construction *kd* + the participle apparently does not exist in reliable GA texts. The parallel expression in the Babylonian Talmud is *ky* – the participle (*supra*, p. 52). As Schlesinger states[56], *kd* does not occur in the Babylonian Talmud except in the following two cases: 1) The Tractates Nedarim, Nazir, etc., the language of which is different from the other tractates; 2) *Speech of Palestinian Amoraim*! How is this possible if *kd* + the participle was non-existent in GA? This phenomenon points to the existence of a common supra-dialectical language (but cf. the discussion of CPA). Before any conclusion may be reached in this regard, a basic study of the language of the Palestinian Amoraim quoted in the Babylonian Talmud must be made.

C. *Word-Final m* > *n*[c]

Nachmanides was apparently the first to note that in the Palestinian Talmud word-final *m* > *n*: "'*yprsn* is like '*yprsm* ('it was divulged'), as one says there (i.e. in the Palestinian Talmud): '*dn* for '*dm* ('person'). R. Issachar b. Naphtali ha-Cohen, the author of *Mattĕnot Kĕhunnah*,

56 Schlesinger, *op. cit.* (p. 52, n. 44), p. 242.

57 '*yprsn . . . kmw 'yprsm kmw š'wmr šm 'dn bmqwm 'dm.*

commentary to Midrash Rabba, independently recognized this phenomenon (See his commentary to Num 1:4)[58]. Among modern scholars, L. Ginsberg[59] has dealt with *'dm* — *'dn*, and both H.L. Ginsberg[60] and M. Yalon[61] have also devoted detailed articles to this subject. S. Lieberman[62] has added additional material. Finally, J.N. Epstein in *MNM*, p. 1230 ff.[63], has elaborated on this subject, especially with regard to the material in the Mishnah. The following study will attempt to define the geographical and chronological limits of this linguistic change. Additional material will be culled not only from literary sources, but also from place names, Greek and Latin transcriptions, and inscriptions.

The following are the main literary sources: The Palestinian Talmud, Aggadic Midrashim, manuscripts of the Mishnah, and Palestinian liturgical poetry. They contain a relatively large amount of material: *'dn* (= *'dm*) "person" (for the examples from Ms. V; cf. *supra*, p. 20); *'yn* (= *'ni*: But here it may be claimed that this is just the Aramaic parallel form): *'ymwn* (= *'ymwm*) "model, form"; *grdwn* (= *grdwm*) "gallows"[64]; *gydn* (= *gydm*) "stump-handed"; *drwn* (= *drwm*) "South"[65]; *ḥkyn* (= *ḥkym*) "wise person"; *ḥmyn* (= *ḥmym*) "warm"; *krn* (= *krm*) "vineyard"; *'yprsn* (= *'yprsm*) "it was divulged"[66]; *hmqrsn* (= *hmqrsm*) "one who trims trees"; *ryqm* (biblical) = *ryqn* (Mishnaic) "empty"[67]; *kšn* (= *kšm*) "just as"; *šn* (= *šm*) "there"; *thwn* (= *thwm*) "abyss." Also: *ṭ'n* (= *ṭ'm*) "to claim"; *lšm* (= *lšwn*) "language" (cf. *supra*, p. 19). Perhaps the interchange *ṣwnn* — *ṣwnyn* — *ṣwnym* "cold water" belongs here[68]. It is, however, possible that the ending *–yn* in the word *ṣwnyn* was

58 See: *Quntrĕsim*, I, p. 31.

59 L. Ginzberg, 'Beiträge zur Lexicographie des Aramäischen', *Festschrift A. Schwartz*, Berlin–Vienna 1917, p. 332.

60 H.L. Ginsberg, 'Zu den Dialekten des Talmudisch-Hebräischen', *MGWJ*, LXXVII (1933), p. 421. This article is important in general for GA.

61 *Ibid.*, pp. 429–430.

62 *Hayerushalmi Kiphshuto*, Introduction, p. 22.

63 A bibliography is given there.

64 The word is therefore not "gradus" but "gradum" (accusative). See: Krauss, *Lehnwörter etc.*, p. 183. There is no difficulty in this assumption, since in vulgar Latin this form dominated.

65 This word did not survive in the primary sources in which it was "corrected" to *drwm*, but is mentioned by Nachmanides as a form occurring in TY. For external proof for this form, cf. *infra.*, p. 64. But Eusebius: *Λαρωμα*. See: *SY*, *s.v. drwm*, n. 1.

66 But according to the commentators there (Y. Kid. III, 4, 64a) this word is not from the root *prsm*.

67 M.H. Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, Oxford 1927, p. 34.

68 Epstein, *MNM*, p. 1242.

mistakenly considered to be the Aramaic plural ending and was "transcribed" into Hebrew. R. Issachar b. Naphtali ha-Cohen in his commentary *Mattĕnot Kĕhuna* to Bĕmidbar Rabba I:8 stated that the midrashic explanation: *hr bšn šb' lšm hqdwš brwk hw'* " 'Mt. Bashan' (Ps 68 16) — "The Holy One, blessed be He, came there," is based on this interchange. Yalon has shown that the ancient liturgical poets of Palestine (R. Eleazar ha-Qallir, etc.) rhymed *m* with *n*. These two consonants were, therefore, identical in pronunciation in word-final position. In his commentary to Eccl 5:1, Abraham ibn Ezra, who did not know the explanation of this phenomenon, attacked R. Eleazar ha-Qallir for "rhyming *ywm* with *pdywn* and *'lywn*."[69] (See Yalon, *ibid.*)[70]. In addition to the above, it should be remembered that Palestinian Mishnah fragments only employ forms such as *rš'yn* (= *rš'ym*) "evil people"; *'tn* (= *'tm*) "you (m. pl.)"; *dntn* (= *dntm*) "you (m.pl.) have judged," etc. These forms, however, do not constitute definite proof.

In my opinion, the word *ṣwnn* (= *ṣwnm*) "rock, stone" (Tos. B. Bath, I, 4; ed. Zuckermandel, p. 398_{12}) should also be added (cf. the commentators). Another example occurs in a letter sent from somewhere in Syria to Jerusalem at the end of the 11th century C. E. (according to Mann; cf. *infra*): *'d šntbrr l'wr ywmn* (= *ywmm*) "until it was clarified in the light of day."[71] A further example occurs in a letter to Elijah ha-Cohen b. Abiathar Gaon (11th cent.): *bkl lby 'ny mtqnm* (= *mtqnn*) "and I lament with all my heart."[72, a]

What is the geographical provenance of this phenomenon? The literary texts as well as indications from other sources (See further on) show it for Galilee. But, in my opinion, it was certainly known in Jerusalem. On ossuaries found in Jerusalem, the name *šlwn* (in Greek transcription

69 *ḫbr ywm 'm pdywn w'lywn.*

70 In my opinion, Ginsberg (*op. cit.*, p. 59, n. 60) is not correct in attributing this also to FPT on the basis of *'abnīm* "stones" 9 (Gen 31:46) and *myym* "water" 47 (Gen 43:24), which have an Aramaic vocalization. Similarly, one can learn nothing from the Hebraism *malkīm* (Ezra 4:13). The same applies to the above-mentioned words.

71 J. Mann, *The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine under the Fatimid Caliphs*, Oxford 1922, II, p. 237, l. 17. Attention should be paid to this and other linguistic phenomena, especially in correspondence from the Geniza. In such cases it is sometimes possible to determine the place and time of a specific linguistic phenomenon (though because of the literary nature of the material, it is not always possible to put it to best use).

72 The letter was published by Mann, *op. cit.*, p. 230, l. 16.

Σαλωμ)[73] is found three times[74] alongside the regular form *šlwm*, *šlm* with *m*. (The form with *m* is also known from Greek transcriptions.) Eusebius and other ancient writers call Queen Salome by the name "Salina."[75] The spring *šlwḥ* is called in the New Testament and in the Septuagint *Σιλωαμ*, but the present-day village nearby it is called Silwān.[76] In my opinion, the spelling in the New Testament is hypercorrective (cf. *infra* on the transcriptions in LXX) and in fact indicates a pronunciation "Silwān." The name *mrym* "Miriam" is found in inscriptions from Jerusalem and also in transcriptions[77] in the form *mryh* "Maria,"[78] a form known from the New Testament. In my opinion, this latter form may more easily be explained from **mryn* than from *mrym*. It is well known that there was a tendency in GA to append a final *n* to undeclinable words ending in a vowel[79].[a] Because of this wavering — appending the *n* was optional[80] — the speaker was apt to consider the *n* of **mryn* as appended, and he might eliminate it[81]. This is indeed the case with several names with final radical *n*. The name *mrwn* is transcribed in Josephus: *Μηρω*, *Μηρωθ* (= *mrw*, *mrwt*), even though *n* is a root letter, etymologically *m* (See *infra*, p. 63). The place name *n'ym* — *n'yn*

73 See, e.g.: Klein, *JPCI*, pp. 26, 27; E.L. Sukenik, *Festschrift S. Krauss*, Jerusalem 1936, p. 92 (Hebrew); in transcription, see, e.g.: Klein, *JPCI*, p. 20.

74 E.L. Sukenik, *Tarbiz*, I/3 (1930), p. 154.

75 E. Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus*, I, New York 1891, p. 308, n. 2.

76 E.g. John 9:7; LXX Is 8:6. See: G. Dalman, *Jerusalem und sein Gelände*, Gütersloh 1930, p. 50.

77 E.g. Klein, *JPCI*, p. 8, etc.; in transcription: Sukenik, *Festschrift S. Krauss*, p. 92.

78 E.L. Sukenik, in *Studies in Memory of A. Gulak and S. Klein*, Jerusalem 1942, p. 133 (Hebrew), also in transcription.

79 H.L. Ginsberg (*op. cit.*, p. 59, n. 60), pp. 428–429; Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 102. The following is an interesting example of the appended *n* in Jerome's writings: *Nasin* (= *hnśy'*) "the prince" (Gen 23:12). See: C. Siegfried, 'Die Aussprache des Hebräischen bei Hieronymus', *ZAW*, IV (1884), p. 53. Thus, there is no need for the emendations of A. Sperber, 'Hebrew based upon Greek and Latin Transliterations', *HUCA*, XII–XIII (1938), p. 207 [offprint p. 105]: *'mh* (II Sam 2:24) — LXX B: AMMAN. Sperber crosses out the appended *n* in other places. Cf. also: *Νωεμειν* (=*n'my*), LXX to Ruth; *Σαλωμων* (=*šlmh*). This matter seems to be complicated. Alt in *ZDPV*, LXVIII (1935), pp. 62–63, note, says that the "n" in the name "Turbon" found in an inscription in the Arabah (2nd — 3rd cent. C.E.) is a "Graezismus"! He may be right. But perhaps this is in conflict with *ν ἐφελκυστικόν*. For this, see: E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*[2], Munich 1953, p. 405.

80 In the Jaffa Inscription (*SY*, p. 80, no. 1), a man is called *Ἰουδα* (= *ywdh*) in Greek, but *ywdn* in Hebrew.

81 The root of the name *mrym* is unclear.

is *Ναις* in Greek. Here also *m* > *n* (See *infra*, p. 64). The name *Shm* is given "Salome" is written both in the Talmud and in non-Jewish sources with out final *n*. The name — as well as the word — *shem*, *shm* is found in the form *Σαλω*. Here also *m* > *n*. From *ywhnn* "Johanan" we get from *ywntn* "Jonathan," *Ἰωναθα* in an inscription from Jaffa. The name *Rwbn* "Reuben" occurs three times in the same inscription. The name *bnymyn* "Benjamin" occurs in the form *Βενιαμις*[82].

With regard to the name *mryn* — *mryh*, one more fact should be added. A Greek speaker would be apt to consider **mryn* as an accusative and might form a new nominative: *mryh*[83]. (This is the opinion of Prof. H. J. Polotsky.) The problem with the proposed derivation was that the middle link in the chain *mrym* > *mryn* > *mryh* was missing. This missing link is now found in SA, in the Samaritan Targum (ed. Nutt)[84] to Num 26:59: *mryn*![a] In my opinion, the same derivation applies to *gy'* (*bn*) *hnm* "Valley of (ben) Hinnom, Hell" which occurs in the New Testament as *γεεννα*. The form without *m* is found in LXX to Jos 18:16, in most of the manuscripts. The form in CPA is *ghn'*, *gyhn'*[85].

82 On the name *Σαλαμψιω*, see: A. Schlatter, *Die hebräischen Namen bei Josephus*, Gütersloh 1913, p. 110. For *šlmṣw*, see, e.g. *AC s.v.* (His emendation is of course superfluous.) Note that on a sarcophagus found in Jerusalem (*CIS* II, no. 156) the inscription *ṣdn mlkt'* "Sadden the Queen" is found in Syriac script alongside *sdh mlkth* in Aramaic script. (Klein, *JPCI*, p. 26, quotes only the Aramaic inscription.) On the form *mrwn*, see: Schlatter, *op. cit.*, p. 73; on the form *mrwn* in Eusebius, see: *The Onomastikon* (trans. E.Z. Melamed) [Hebrew], no. 664; on the name *C.I.I.12* (= *šlw*), see: Sukenik, *Kedem*, II (1945), p. 29. It is found also at Rome; see: J.B. Frey, *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum*, I, Rome 1936, p. 373. The name *Καλλω* appears in a Byzantine inscription found at Evron, near Nahariah, in September 1951 (Oral communication from Dr. M. Avi-Yonah); *διὰ σαλω* (= *bšlwm*) "in peace" occurs in an inscription from Jaffa (*SY*, p. 82, no. 21); *σαλω* "peace" appears in an inscription from Beth She'arim (*ibid.*, p. 171, no. 36). For the name pair *ywḥnn-ywḥnn* see, e.g. Klein, *EG*, p. 67; *Ἰωναθᾶ* "Jonathan" (*SY*, p. 80, no. 1); *Ρωβὴ* "Reuben" (p. 83, no. 26; p. 84, no. 34; p. 85, no. 38). Other abbreviated names are to be found there, but they are few in number. BENIAMIC "Benjamin" (p. 81, no. 11). The Samaritan Pentateuch reads *bnymym* for *bnymyn*; however, in my opinion, the reason for this is that the ending *–yn* was felt to be the Aramaic plural ending and the name was "hebraicized" to *bnymym*. In the transcriptions of Jerome both *iamin* and *iamim* are found. See: C. Siegfried, *ZAW*, IV (1887), p. 48. (This is not given in Sperber's list.) I was unable to check this in the original.

83 What is the connection between *mrym-mryn* and *Μαρ[ι]αμεν* in an inscription from Beth She'arim? See: M. Schwabe and B. Lifshitz, *Beth She'arim*, vol. II *The Greek Inscriptions*, Jerusalem 1967, p. 3, no. 8 (Hebrew).

84 J.W. Nutt, *Fragments of a Samaritan Targum*, London 1874.

85 Schulthess, *L.S*, p. 34.

al-dārūn "Gate of the South"[90], is even more instructive, since *d* appears in the form *drwn* in the passage from the Palestinian Talmud cited by Nachmanides. This gives us a southernmost point for the spread of this phenomenon. A northernmost point is provided by the Tariff of Palmyra. The word *md'm* "something" appears twice in the form *md'n* alongside the forms *md'm*, and even *md'm'*[92]. This shows that in the period under discussion (137 C.E.) this linguistic phenomenon was known also in Palmyra. From a geographic point of view, the limits are then Palmyra and Gaza, and from a chronological point of view, from the first century C.E. (the probable dates of the Jerusalem ossuary inscriptions; Palmyra, second century C.E.) until the eleventh century C.E. (the letter from the Geniza). The rhyme from the Geniza from the same century is additional proof (and present-day Palestinian Arabic?).

However, it seems that this interchange began much earlier, since there are indications of it already in LXX. In LXX, there are interchanges *m–n* — i.e. *m* occurs instead of *n* — and *vice versa* in transcriptions of personal and place names. In my opinion, this can only be explained by the above-mentioned linguistic change[93]. There is no doubt as to the antiquity of the form since Origen already notes it (See *infra*, p. 65). The fact that *n* is written for *m* at the end of a word shows that this is just a hypercorrected form, i.e. the writer is aware of the fact that some words are written with final *m*, but pronounced with *n*. He thus erred and wrote *m* at the end of words — especially uncommon ones — which should actually end in *n*. A list of randomly selected names will suffice to prove this statement.

The following list of place names is taken from Eusebius' *Onomasticon*[94]:

No. 48: *'ylwn* (Jos 10:12) — LXX: *Αιλων*; Eu.: *Αἰλών*. He adds: "Near the village called Ailon to this day."

90 G. Kampffmeyer, 'Alte Namen im heutigen Palästina und Syrien', *ZDPV*, XV (1892), p. 65. According to him, this phenomenon occurs in the Arabic of central Syria. In medieval Arabic sources, the two forms with *m* (*darūm*) and *n* occur (ib.). See *SI*, *s.v. kpr drwm*.

91 *CIS*, II/3, no. 3913, l. 5; *ibid.*, no. 3959. See also: Rosenthal, *SPI*, p. 52. His explanation is far-fetched.

92 Rosenthal, *ibid.*

93 Sperber's emendations, *op. cit.* (p. 61, n. 79), for the forms *mbśm Μαβσαν* (p. 234), *mym Αβιλμαιν* (p. 236); *'qrbym Ακραβειν* (p. 249); etc. are therefore unnecessary.

94 The material is taken from: *The Onomastikon of Eusebius* (trans. E.Z. Melamed), offprint from *Tarbiz*, XIX (1949); XXI (1951). The numbers refer to the entries in this edition. The variants are taken from A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, Stuttgart 1935.

No. 107: *'sm* (Jos 19:3) — A B: *Ασομ*; Eu.: *Ασαν*.
No. 142: *'ylwn* (Judg 12:12): — B: *Αιλωμ*; A: *Αιλιμ*; Eu.: *Αιαλίν*.
No. 207: *b'tm* (Num 33:6) — LXX: *Βουθαν*; so Eu., who adds: "also called *Ἰτθάμ*" (See the notes, *ibid.*).
No. 208: *gšn* (Gen 47:27) — LXX, Eu.: *Γεσέμ*.
No. 316: *gšn* (Jos 10:41) — LXX: *Γοσομ*; Eu.: *Γοσόν*.
No. 327: *gšn* (Jos 15:51) — LXX: *Γοσομ*; Eu.: *Γισών*.
No. 366: *rsn* (Gen 10:12) — LXX, Eu.: *Δασέμ*.
No. 397: *'dn* (Gen 2:8) — LXX, Eu.: *'Εδέμ*; but Jerome's transcription is the same as the Hebrew.
No. 414: *'glwn* (Jos 12:12) — LXX: *Αιλαμ*; A*, Eu.: *'Εγλών*.
No. 416: *ḥsrwn* (Jos 15:25) — LXX: *Ασερων*; Eu.: *'Εσρών*.
No. 650: *mdyn*[95] — "The city is called *Μαδιάμ*, . . . and (the land) is called today *Μαδιανή*." Thus, Eusebius knew that in his time the name ended in *n*, but from the version of LXX which he had before him, he quotes a form with final *m* (cf. above *'ylwn*, *b'tm*). With regard to LXX, see the various references, e.g. Ex 3:1; 18:1, etc. The spelling *mdym* occurs also in IQIs[a] 9: 3; 60: 6.[a]
No. 669: *mrwm* (Jos 11:7) — LXX, Eu.: *Μαρρων*, etc.; Jerome: *Merrom* (See the entry, *ibid.*, and the comments of the editor, Dr. Melamed).

Some additional names:

1. *'ḥyrm* (Num 26:38 [42]) — LXX: *Ιαχιραν*.
2. *'ylwn* (Judg 12:12) — B: *Αιλωμ*.
3. *'ylwn* (Gen 26:34) — A: *Αιλωμ*.
4. *'ylwm* (Gen 36:2) — A: *Ελωμ*.
5. *'ytn* (I Kings 5:11) — L[+]: *Αιθαμ*.
6. *'ytn* (I Chron 2:6) — B: *Αιθαμ*[96].
7. *'ḥy'm* (II Sam 23:33) — LXX: *Αχιαν* (cf. the critical apparatus).
8. *'ḥyn* (I Chron 7:19) — LXX: *Ιααιμ* (cf. the critical apparatus).
9. *ḥṣrwn* (I Chron 2:5 [4]) — A Vpl: *Εσρωμ*.
10. *ḥṣrwn* (Ruth 4:18) — A: *Εσρωμ* (but see *ibid.*, v. 19).
11. *rm* (Ruth 4:19) — B A[+]: *Αρραν* (2×; cf. the critical apparatus).
12. *'byrm* (Num 16:1; 12; etc.) — LXX: *Αβιρων*. Interestingly, on v. 24, there is an addition marked by *, i.e. Origin changed the LXX version to harmonize it with the Hebrew text: *δαθαν και αβειρωμ*. Interesting also is an addition in A*: *αβειρων*! CPA: *'byrwn*[97].

95 This name was pointed out to me by Rabbi E.S. Rosenthal.
96 See the note, *ibid.*, with regard to the other references.
97 Schulthess, *LS*, p. 2.

Scholars have occasionally noticed this phenomenon. Seeligman[98] hints at it, and Brønno[99] also deals with it. The latter who only had a small part of the material before him, tried to explain it as an orthographic variant. In light of the numerous examples brought above, and the fact that they all occur at the end of the word, this explanation is untenable. The large number of examples also contradicts Speiser's opinion[100] that this is a Greek phenomenon. As pointed out above, the spelling *mdym* (= *mdyn*) in $1QIs^a$ points to this phenomenon.

LXX and $1QIs^a$ bring us back to the first centuries B.C.E.; however, we may go one step further. In my opinion, the same *šlwn* (Neh 3:15) is identical with the name *šlwm*[101]. The name *ntwm* "Nathum" at Elephantine[102] is only a scribal error for *ntwn* under the influence of the preceeding *ytwm* "Yathom." I do not think that the name pairs *gršwm — gršwn*, *kmhm — kmhn* or the words *tnym — tnyn* "serpent, sea monster," etc., in Biblical Hebrew should be considered part of this phenomenon, since they are chronologically much earlier. These words are either a matter of an exegetical explanation, have an undetermined root, or are occasionally influenced by the Aramaic ending *-yn*[103]. With regard to the place name *byt hrm — byt hrn*, Mazar (Maisler) is of the opinion that the form is to be analyzed as *hr* + *m* (or *n*). The word was understood later on as being composed of the definite article (*h-*) + *rm*[104], from which the Talmudical name derives[105].

It should be pointed out, that Brockelmann[106] lists this phenomenon as occurring in the Semitic linguistic family mainly in one place, viz. North Arabia.[a] This explains Arabic *'in* "if" = Hebrew *'im*, etc., and the

98 J.L. Seeligman, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, Leiden 1948, p. 65, n. 40. He seems to be the only one who noticed that this is the Hebrew-Aramaic *m-n* interchange, and he refers to Ginsberg's article (*op. cit.*, p. 59, n. 60). His note is based mainly on translations of Hebrew words into Greek and not on personal names.

99 E. Brønno, *Studien über hebräische Morphologie und Vokalismus*, Leipzig 1943, p. 435.

100 J.A. Speiser, *JQR*, XXIII (1932–33), p. 257.

101 M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen*, Stuttgart 1928, p. 258, is unable to explain the name. According to the explanation given here, there is no reason to emend the name to *šlwm*, even though this is the form which appears in several manuscripts and in the Peshitta.

102 Cowley, *AP*, p. 127.

103 See the examples quoted by Seeligman, *op. cit.*

104 W. Borée, *Die alten Ortsnamen Palästinas*, Leipzig 1930, p. 76, is also of the opinion that there are two forms here.

105 See *SY*, *s.v.*

106 *GVG*, I, p. 136, § 48.

fact that *m* is rhymed with *n* in the Qur'ān (as in the contemporary Jewish liturgical poetry!). It is interesting to find this phenomenon close-by both geographically and chronologically. May we assume direct influence? Brockelmann's examples from Medieval Arabic are not to the point, since they are the same above-mentioned places[107] in the area of Palestine and Syria, and these are just Aramaic loans in Arabic. In light of this, it may be proposed that Arabic *balasān* "balsam" is a borrowing from Palestinian Aramaic[108].

Under what conditions did this linguistic change take place? There are many verbs and nouns with final *m* where there is no indication of this change! The reason for this seems clear. If one examines the list of words given at the beginning of the discussion (*supra*, p. 59), it will be seen that most of them are undeclinable: *'dm — 'dn* "person"; *šm — šn* "there"; *grdwm — grdwn* "gallows"; *drwm — drwn* "South"; *'ymwm — 'ymwn* "form"; etc. But in declinable words such as *'m* "mother," *m* was restored due to the "Systemzwang," i.e. since *m* remained in declination — *'m'* "my mother," etc. — it was preserved in cases such as *'m* "mother" where *m* occurred in the final position. In place names like *špr'm* "Sheframam" where *n* was kept, as against *mrwn* (< *mrwm*) "Meron," either the declinable presposition *'im* "with" or the noun *'am* "nation" influenced. Theoretically, it may also be supposed that this linguistic change did not reach every single place, just as it did not reach the areas where CPA and SA(?) were spoken.

D. The Gutturals (Laryngeals and Pharyngeals) in Galilee

Previous Opinions on the Subject

It is an accepted fact that the gutturals were weakened in Galilee. Differences of opinion on the subject center around the extent of this weakening. Dalman[109] — who devoted an entire chapter in his grammar to a comprehensive treatment of the problem — was of the opinion that there was indeed a weakening, but not a complete confusion. On the other hand, Kahle[110] claims that there was no clear pronunciation of the gutturals when the Masoretes began their work. With regard to the

107 *Op. cit.*, n. 90.
108 For the forms of the word, see: Löw, *Flora*, I, pp. 302-303.
109 *Grammatik*, pp. 57 ff.; 96 ff. See especially, p. 58 (bot.).
110 Kahle, *CG*, pp. 86–95, especially, p. 94.

confusion this seems to be approximately the position of J.N. Epstein[111]. According to this opinion, the use of *h*, *ḥ*, and ' in Galilean texts reflects only the historical orthography, as is the case in Mandaic and TA[112] in the East, and SA in Palestine[113]. If later we find that the value of the gutturals is known in the Masoretic period, then — according to Kahle — this is attributable only to the influence of the Arabs from whom the Masoretes learned anew their pronunciation[114]. It goes without saying how important a new clarification of this problem may be, even if it does not lead to a final solution. This matter now has added significance with the discovery of IQIs[a] — in which there is clear proof of the loss of the gutturals already in the First Temple Period[115].

Direct Evidence

Before examining the nature of the texts themselves in which the orthography may mask the true state of affairs, we should first clarify the direct (i.e. the contemporary) evidence on the nature of their pronunciation. Logically, our primary source should be evidence from the sources closest to the matter, viz. evidence from the inhabitants of Palestine and from Palestinian sources. Secondarily, evidence from foreigners, i.e. from statements in the Babylonian Talmud, may be employed. This is even more to the point when the witnesses are prejudiced in their judgment.

In this case, scholars did not investigate the situation according to the above criteria. For some reason they relied on the dictum of the Babylonian Talmud (Erub. 53b): *bny yhwdh dyyqy lyšn'* "The Judeans are careful in speaking," whereas *bny glyl (d)l' dyyqy lyšn'* "The Galileans are not careful in speaking."[116] Then, as proof, there follows the famous story about the Galilean (*ibid.*): *dhhw' br glyl' dhwh q'zyl w'mr lhw 'mr*

111 He deals with this in several places in his book. See: *MNM*, p. 8 ff.; 183 ff.; 1227 ff.

112 See: Nöldeke, *MG*, p. 57 ff., with regard to Mandaic and TA.

113 See, e.g. Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *Tarbiz*, X (1939), p. 334.

114 So Kahle, *CG*, pp. 94–95. He objects to the opinion that the Masoretes learnt the pronunciation from the inhabitants of Judea. (This was the contention of Leander who also believed that the gutturals were not pronounced in Galilee.)

115 See my book: *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*, Jerusalem 1959, p. 42 (Hebrew); H. Yalon, *Kirjath Sepher*, XXVII (1950–51), p. 166.

116 Incidentally, the sentence attributed to the Judeans does not prove that they pronounced the gutturals.

ḥa'n 'm ḥm'n? 'mrw lyh: glyl'h šwṭh ḥmr ḥmyrkb 'w ḥmr ḥmyšty? 'mr ḥmylḥ
'w 'mr l'ṯḥs'h "A certain Galilean once went about inquiring 'Who has *amar*? Who has *amar*?' 'Foolish Galilean,' they said to him, 'do you mean an 'ass' for riding, 'wine' to drink, "wool' for clothing, or a 'lamb' for daughtering?' " According to this story the Galileans did not distinguish between ' (*'immar* "sheep"), *ḥ* (which is etymologically *ḥ* [*ḥămârâ* – Arabic *ḥimâr* – Hebrew *ḥămōr* "ass"]), and *ḥ* which is etymologically *ḥ* (*ḥamrâ* – Arabic *ḫamr* – Hebrew *ḥemer* "wine") and ' (*'ămar* "wool"). Cf. also the other stories which Dalman attempts to explain[117]. In attempting to explain this story, three positions may be taken: 1. The story may be taken at its face value. 2. The story has no value at all and merely reflects the situation *actually* prevailing in Babylonia where the gutturals were apparently completely lost. 3. The story contains a grain of truth, but, in the manner of Talmudic legend, it is greatly exaggerated.

The correct interpretation depends on the facts to be found in the Palestinian sources, i.e. explicit reports and linguistic evidence from reliable texts.

What do the Palestinian sources have to say concerning the pronunication of the gutturals?

A *Baraitha* (Y. Ber. 4d, according to YFG 7) states: *tny 'yn m'byrym lpny ḥtybh l' ḥypyn* (ed. pr.: *ḥypnyn*) *wl' bšnyn wl' ṭb'wnyn mpny šḥn 'wšyn ḥytyn ḥwtyn*(!) *w'ynyn 'ynyn* (ed. pr.: *hyhyn ḥytyn w'yynyn ''yn*)[a] "It is learned: It is forbidden to send before the ark (to lead in the prayers) inhabitants of Haifa, Beisan, and Tibon, since they pronounce *ḥet*'s like *he*'s, and *'ayin*'s like *alef*'s (ed. pr.: *he*'s like *ḥet*'s, and *'ayin*'s like *alef*'s)." A similar statement is given in the Babylonian Talmud (Meg. 24b) where only the confusion ' — ' is mentioned. The following statement is also made (B Ber. 32a): *dby R.'ly'zr bn y'qb qwryn l'lpyn 'yynyn wl'yynyn 'lpyn* "In the school of R. Eliezer, *alef*'s were pronounced like *'ayin*'s and *'ayin*'s like *alef*'s."

From the above statements we learn not only that the correct pronunciation of the gutturals was lost in the places mentioned, but, conversely, that contemporaneously their correct pronunciation was *not* lost in other places, even in Galilee. If this were not the case, what point would there be in placing a prohibition on just the inhabitants of the above-mentioned places? Moreover, there is no reason to believe that the *Baraitha* testifies to *all of Palestine*. It seems reasonable to assume that it applies only to Galilee and the surrounding territory.[b]

In addition to this [illegible] — probably to be dated to the 2nd cent. C.E. — there is decisive evidence for the end of the 2nd cent. C.E., as Dalman has correctly pointed out. The Babylonian Talmud (*Meg.* 24b) says of R. Ḥiyya: *kl ʾbkly ʾyhwh ʾyhwh ʾl tʾmyt mhrp wmgdp* "When you come to the verse 'I will wait for the Lord' (Is 8:17) will you not be a reviler and a blasphemer?" (Rashi comments on this passage: "He would read *ḥ*'s for *h*'s, and he appeared to say 'I will hit'.") The Talmud states that the others were able to distinguish between these two consonants, but only R. Ḥiyya, who was a Babylonian (cf. *infra*, p. 69), pronounced *h* for *ḥ*.

There are additional examples which show that Galilean *ḥ* appears in the Babylonian Talmud as *h*:

The name *ʾḥwwh* (*br zʿyrʾ*) "Aḥva (b. Zeʿera)" is written in the Babylonian Talmud in the form *ʾhbh* "Ahava."[119] The place name *kpr ḥnnyh* (= *ḥnnyʾ* = *ḥnʾ*) "Kefar Ḥanania" appears in the Babylonian Talmud in the form *kpnʾ* (See *infra*, the list of Galilean place names). Similarly, *gbʿʾ* "Gebiah" in Galilee is called *gbyhh* in the Babylonian Talmud. *R. ḥwnʾ* "R. Ḥuna" in the Palestinian Talmud is *R. hwn*' in the Babylonian Talmud[120]. This is explicit proof that at the end of the 2nd cent. C.E. *h* and *ḥ* were two distinct phonemes in Galilee[121]. Nevertheless, there is proof for a certain linguistic change to which insufficient attention has been paid until now, viz. the linguistic change *ḥ* > ʿ[122].

The Linguistic Change *ḥ* > ʿ in Palestine[123]

BR. p. 254. reads according to Ms. V, as follows: *ʿwh ʿwh ʿwh ʾśymnw ʾwl(ʾ) R. ʾlʿzr bR. šmʿwn šḥyw bqyym bʿprwt knḥš ⟨b⟩glylh ṣwhyn lḥwyh ʿwyh* "'A ruin, a ruin, a ruin I will make it' (Ezek 21:32) — R. Eleazar

118 *R. ʾlʿzr qwrʾ lḥytyn hyhyn nrʾh kʾwmr whkyty.*

119 See J.N. Epstein, *Tarbiz*, V (1934), p. 258. *ʾḥww*' occurs twice in *BR*, Ms. V, [illegible] (in the basic text once: *ʾhbh*); *ʾḥww*' *by R. zʿwrh* (*zʿyrʾ*) *ibid.*, pp. 1233, 1235. See Epstein's opinion on this phenomenon in *Tarbiz*, I/3 (1930), p. 136.

120 See e.g. Frankel, *op. cit.* (p. 36, n. 85), pp. 73–74. Not surprisingly the reading *ḥwn* is common in TY. (I have not checked the reliable texts on this point.)

121 According to Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 59, Jerome (4th — 5th cents. C.E.) testifies to this however, this is not completely clear. See Sperber, *op. cit.* (p. 61, n. 79), pp. 110–111 [offprint pp. 8–9], and *infra*, p. 89.

122 See I. Ginzberg, *Essays and Studies in Memory of Linda R. Miller*, New York 1938, pp. 80–81.

123 For a discussion of this phenomenon in an Arabic dialect, see: Ch. Rabin, *Ancient West-Arabian*, London 1951, p. 84 ff.

b. R. Simeon said: 'They were experts on the quality of soil like a serpent. In Galilee they call a serpent *'iwyā* (for *ḥiwyā*)'." This shows that in Galilee in the 2nd cent. C.E. *ḥ* > '. That this linguistic change is not limited to just this one word is shown by the following examples:

1. Deharim Rabba (ed. Lieberman), p. 1: *'(mr) R.Š.B.L. bglyl' qwryn lḥtr' 'tr'* "R. Joshua b. Levi said: 'In Galilee they call a breach *'athrā* (for *ḥathrā*)'."[124] This testimony is from the 3rd cent. C.E.

2. Echa Rabba to Lam 2:1, according to the Pezarro edition[125]: *'ykh d'pw 'mr R. ḥm' br R. ḥnyn': 'yk ḥyyb h' brwgzyh . . . 'yt 'tr' dṣwwḥyn lhwh' 'yyb'* " 'How in His anger He set under a cloud' — R. Ḥama b. R. Ḥanina said: 'How God has convicted in His anger! There is a place where they call the guilty one *'ayyābā* (for *ḥayyābā*)'." These examples do not prove anything for Galilee, since this phenomenon is found also in "Arabia" (See n. 124), in SA, and in CPA (*infra*, p. 75). The fact that R. Judah the Prince and Bar Kappara call R. Ḥiyya — either in jest or disdain — by the name *'yy'* (B. M.Kat. 16b; Ker. 8a) is proof of the change[126]. It must be assumed that this is the vulgar form and not R. Ḥiyya's own pronunciation, since R. Ḥiyya pronounced *ḥ* as *h* (See *supra*, p. 70). The story about Ḥiyya, Rabbi Judah the Prince, and Bar Kappara testifies to the fact that in Galilee at the end of the 2nd cent. C.E., *ḥ* was still pronounced.

124 This saying is quoted in *BR*, p. 681 (according to the *editio princeps*) in a different form, without mentioning the name of the place. In other places: *b'rbyy' ṣwwḥyn* "In Arabia they call," and the statement is attributed to R. Leazar b. R. Simeon for *hwyh-'wyh* "serpent" in Galilee. Incidentally, this shows that these are not the words of the redactor of *BR*, as Ginzberg, *ibid.*, suspected. In another place the statement refers to Arabia, but in the name of R. Levi who often cites forms from Arabia (i.e. Northern Transjordan; see: *SY*, *s.v.* *'rbyy'*); cf. Theodor's commentary, *BR*, p. 682. It seems that two statements were confused here: 1) That of R. Leazar b. R. Simeon (or perhaps: R. Simeon b. Lakish) regarding Galilee; 2) that of R. Levi regarding Arabia. For the statements on Arabia, see: W. Bacher, *Die Agada der palästinischen Amoräer*, II, Strassburg 1896, p. 303, n. 3.

125 — ed Buber, p. 96, with slight differences. If the reading is correct, there is also an interpretation based on the interchange *k* — '.

126 So also Lev. 41a (according to the reading in the *Sifra Meqabbeṣ*, 10; see: Epstein, *MNM*, p. 185. In my opinion there is no proof from Bar Kappara that the interchange *ḥ* — ' was widespread in the southern region. Perhaps he was just following the local (i.e. Galilean) custom (cf. *loc. cit.*). The fact that we find this interchange mentioned three times concerning the same name, but never with regard to any other name, may show that we are dealing with a period when the interchange was still uncommon and was thus easily remembered.

Of course, the expression *bglyl' qwryn* "In Galilee they call" does not refer to all of Galilee. R. Ḥama b. Ḥanina would not have said: *'yt 'tr* "there is a place" were this a widespread phenomenon in Galilee, and R. Levi would not have bothered to mention it together with "Arabia" — even though he often cites pronunciations from there — were this phenomenon prevalent in all of Galilee[126]. This again points out two things: 1) The *'* was pronounced (all of the references concerning *'ayin*); 2) The *ḥ* had begun to change into *'*. (Does *'yt 'tr'* "there is a place" mean Galilee?) This conclusion is confirmed from Rabbinic sources, from SA, to a small extent from CPA, and from place names.[a]

Rabbinic Sources

Nachmanides in his commentary on the Torah (Deut 2:23: *wh'wym* "and the Avvim") states: "In my opinion, the Avvim (*'wym*) are the Ḥivvim (*ḥwym*). In *BR* (chap. 26, p. 254) — R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon said: 'In Galilee they call the serpent *'iwyå* (for *ḥiwyå*).' And the sages sometimes called the snake *'kn*' and sometimes *ḥkyn*'. And they said (Wayyikra Rabba, chap. 30, p. 697): 'And he prayed' — R. Levi said: 'In Arabia they call a breach *ḥătīrå* (for *'ătīrå*).' And they said (Echa Rabba, chap. 2): 'How has God covered a cloud in His anger' — R. Ḥama b. R. Ḥanina said: 'How has God committed them in His anger! There is a place where they call a guilty person *'ayyåbå* (for *ḥayyåbå*), *ḥuqqim* ("rungs of a ladder") — *'uqqīm*.' Concerning R. Ḥiyya the phrase is common: 'What does 'Iyya say in this matter?' Our Rabbis used to say that the phrase *hysḥ hd't* 'diversion of the mind' is in place of *hsy' hd't*. In the Palestinian Talmud and in the Mishnah *hsy'* always occurs (instead of *hsyḥ*): *whsy' 't lbw ml'kwl* 'He abandoned the thought of eating (Mishnah Toh. VII, 8). According to the commentators, *'wšw* (Joel 4:11) is the same as *ḥwšw* 'hasten (m.pl.)!' In the Mechilta (ed. Lauterbach, p. 31) R. Joslah says: 'Do not read *wpsḥty* ('and I will protect'), but *wps'ty* ('and I will step over')'."[127]

126 See the place names mentioned *supra*, n. 124.

127 *w'l dy ḥ wym hm ḥḥwym . . . wblbl' syt rbh 'mr R. 'l'zr brbv šm'wn . . . bglyl' s'wn lhwy 'ny wnhgw bn ḥknwm lqrwtw 'kn' wlqrwtw ḥkvn' w'mrw wy'tr . . . 'mr rbv bvbv šnḥyt ḥtyh 'mh w'mrw 'ykh y'yb b'pw h' 'mr rbv ḥm' bR. ḥnyn' 'yk hwh n wngsn 'yt 'tr dyswḥyn ḥyb' 'yb' ḥwqvm 'wqvm wnwrgl hw' blswn kmh 'wy' (read 'yy') wnn lbw -n 'l R. ḥnyn' wkn nhgw ibwtvnw lwmr 'l hysḥ hd't šhw' bmqwm hvs hd't wlpvmsvng l wlm hsy' wbmsnh whsy' 't lbw ml'kwl wkn 'mrw hmpršym b'wšw wlw kl ḥgvvm šhw' ḥwšw wbmkyld' rby y'syh 'wmr 'l tqry wpsḥty 'l' wps'ty . . . 's w mlswn ḥs'mt.*

If we leave out the Midrashic material, such as *pshty — ps'ty*, from which no certain proof can be adduced (see below), we have still found several words in the Palestinian Talmud in which ' is used for *ḥ*: *'wqym* (= *ḥwqym*) "rungs of a ladder"[128]; *hsy'w* (= *hsyḥw*) "they neglected"; *R. 'yy'* (= *R. ḥyy'*) "R. Ḥiyya." A glance at the dictionary shows that this is indeed the case. These words are characteristic of the language of Galilee.

Besides the material which Nachmanides lists, there are many additional signs of this interchange in reliable texts: *tw'lt — twḥlt* "hope, expectation" *BR*, p. 337 (Ms. V: *twḥlt*; see the critical apparatus. The interpretation is based on Gen 9:20: *wyḥl nḥ* 'And Noah began'); similarly, *ibid.*, p. 257 (no variants). The original form seems to have been *tw'lt*; however, since the scribes knew that ' was occasionally pronounced like *ḥ*, they were apt to write an ' for an original *ḥ* (hypercorrection). Instead of *ndḥwk* "we will mock" *BR*, p. 699, Ms. V[2] reads: *nd'wk. gby'h br qwsm* "Gebiah b. Qosem" *ibid.*, p. 666 (Ms. V) is identical with *gbyh' bn psys'* in the Babylonian Talmud (Sanh. 91a). From the story it is clear that *gby'h = gbyḥ* "hump-back." As was shown above, Galilean *ḥ* = Babylonian *h* (cf. *ibid.*: *hgby'* "the hump-back"; *gbhtk* "your hump" 669). Theodor pointed out in his commentary to the passage, *ibid.*, that Pseudo-Jonathan translates *gibben* "hunchback" (Lev 21:20) by *gbyḥ*, var. *gby'*[129]. The meaning of the word *gbḥ* is undoubtedly "hump-back" (See the dictionaries). Even *gbyḥ wgbḥt* (Bekh. 45b, according to the reading of the Aruch, *s.v.*), refers to this meaning, according to the explanation of the Talmud: *b'ryk' šmyṭh*. Rashi comments[130]: "Since he is slight he cannot bear his stature and is *bent over*." The explanation given in the Aruch is: "Tall and bent over."[131] The correctness of this explanation is proved from CPA. The translation of *συγκύπτουσα* "bent over" (Luke 13:11) is *gbyḥ'*[132]. It is clear that the following passage (*BR*, chap. 12, p. 102; Ms. V is deficient at this point) is based on this root: . . . *kngd ššh dbrym šnyṭlw m'dm hr'šwn w'ylw hn zyww whyyw wqwmtw . . . 'mr R. 'yybw qwmtw gb'h wn'šṭ šlm'h 'mh* "Corresponding to the six things which were taken from Adam: His radience, his life, his stature, etc. R. Akiba said: 'His stature was diminished and became 100

128 On this word, see: J.N. Epstein, *Tarbiz*, 1/3 (1930), p. 135.
129 This is missing in Ginsburger's edition.
130 *lpy šdq hw' 'ynw ykwl lsbwl qwmtw wnkpp.*
131 *y(š) m(pršym) 'rwk wgḥn.*
132 There is no need for the emendation in Schulthess, *LS*, p. 33.

rabbis (cf. Theodor's commentary). Similarly: *gww'h* (or: *gww'b*) *qwmtw* ... *hsr' 'hd mnh* "His stature was diminished and became 100 cubits" *Gen. r.* p. 115 (according to Ms. V, here *w* — *b* as in other places). The interchange *hwb* — *'wb* "bosom" is also due to this linguistic change. The original form was most likely *bwb*[133] (cf. Job 31:33: *bḥbwbbt* "in my bosom")[134]. The interchange *mt'lpyn* — *mthlpyn* "they faint" (Tos. Taan. I, 8 (ed. Zuckermandel 215$_{10}$) belongs here[135], as does *'rpd'* — *hrpt'* "hat"[136]. The reading *hybwr 'yr* — *'ybwr 'yr* "extension of the city limits" (Y. Maas. 50d; Sota 22d)[137] is due to this change. The possibility should be investigated whether *'ybwr* in this sense is not really *hybwr* "connection," which was written with ' because no connection with *hybwr* was felt[138]. The interchanges *ḥrgwzw* (*hrgwzw*) — *'kwzw* (*'kwzw*) (both words are euphemisms for "buttocks") seem to be based on this phenomenon[139].

Additional examples from reliable texts: *'wqh dswlmh* "the rung of the ladder" YFG 194$_{23}$; *hsy' d't* "distraction of thought" YFG 138$_8$. From the regular editions, Dalman (*Grammatik*, pp. 98–99) lists the following words: *'hyṣ* — *ḥbyṣ* "a certain dish"; *rtḥ* — *rt'* "to boil"[140]; *'zm* — *ḥzm* "to cut, trim." It seems proper to check the Galilean vocabulary from this point of view. L. Ginzberg's suggestion that *'ṭypt pnym* = *ḥṭybt pnym* "facial expression" is also based on this phonetic change[141].

A Midrash in *Debarim Rabba* (ed. Lieberman), p. 73, is explicable in light of this linguistic change: *'ly plšt 'trw"y 'lw plšty šhn bqy'yn btkbwst w'tydyn lhywt mkbsyn klyhm šl yśr'l* " 'Philistia, cry aloud because of me' (Ps 60:10) — These are the Philistines who are expert at washing (clothes), and in the future they will wash the clothes of Israel." This Midrash was properly interpreted by Z. Ben-Ḥayyim[142] on the basis of SA: *r'* "to wash" (Arabic *rḥḍ*, Hebrew *rḥṣ*, Aramaic *rḥ'* > SA

133 See Gesenius-Buhl *s.v. ḥb*. This is not quoted in Brockelmann, *LS*^{2}, *s.v. 'b*.
134 On this word, see *AG* and *AAG*, *s.v. ḥb* (II).
135 S. Lieberman, *Tosepheth Rishonim*, I, p. 219.
136 Epstein, *MNM*, p. 12, n. 2.
137 *Ibid.* p. 10.
138 Cf. *dmr* (= *d'mr*) *rby šm'wn bn lqyš vkwl 'ny l'śwt šth' byt m'wn mt'brt 'm tbry* "R. Simeon b. Lakish said: I can make it happen that Beth Maon and Tiberias will come together" (Y. Erub V, 1, 22b). The relationship between this root and *'wbr* "fetus," *'bwr* "shoot, sprout" should be investigated.
139 The material has been gathered, by Epstein, *MNM*, p. 10 ff.
140 Cf. CVA, *infra*, n. 155.
141 *Op. cit.* (p. 70, n. 122), pp. 79–80.
142 *Tarbiz*, XIX (1949), p. 200.

r‘; for the reason, cf. *infra*). The Midrash is based on the language of Galilee, i.e. general Aramaic *rḥ‘* = GA *r‘*. (To be sure, this root is not to be found in any GA text, but only in SA.) If J.N. Epstein[143] is correct in taking *‘wzq* = *ḥwzq* "holding fast" (B. Ḥullin 94a), then we have an additional example. Note that this word occurs in a *Baraitha* attributed to R. Eliezer b. Jacob in whose academy *‘ayin*'s were pronounced as *alef*'s, and *alef*'s as *‘ayin*'s (B. Ber. 32a; but there were apparently two scholars by this name). The expression *‘g ‘wgh* "he drew a circle" (Mishnah Taan. III, 8) = *ḥg ḥwgh*. The root *ḥwg* occurs in Biblical Hebrew, TO, and Syriac (See dictionaries). Is CPA *ḥgl* = GA *‘gl* "to go around" (so the dictionaries)? What is the relationship between *pṣḥ* — *pṣ‘* "to burst open" in the Palestinian Talmud[144]?

Galilean place names (though not all of them!) testify to this linguistic change. The biblical *’ănåḥărât* (Jos 19:19) occurs with ‘ in the Midrash as *n‘wrn*, and in Arabic as *an-Nā‘ūra*[145]. *kpr ḥnnyh* is called in Rabbinic sources *kpr ḥnn* (*BR*, Ms. V, p. 235) – *‘nn* and in the Babylonian Talmud *kpr ḥynh*[146] (cf. *supra* on *ḥkyty* — *hkyty*; *’ḥwwh* — *’hbh*). The place name *ḥwsyph* is today *‘Usufya*[147]. The identification of *ḥprym* — *‘prym* today is doubtful (see below)[148]. If the other place names preserved the original *ḥ* (see below), then this shows that this linguistic change did not spread everywhere. The phrase *bglylh ṣwwḥyn* "in Galilee they call" (*supra*, p. 72) does not necessarily refer to all of Galilee. Note: *’yt ’tr’* "there is a place." This explains why the Palestinian poets rhyme *ḥ* with *‘*[149].

The situation in SA is very interesting. At first glance, the orthography seems to be completely haphazard, and no reason may be discerned why the scribes interchange all of the gutturals without distinction. However, even a cursory investigation will show a surprising phenomenon. As a sample of SA, let us take the Samaritan Targum (ed. Brüll) to Gen 43. In order to arrive at the true state of affairs, we will list all words with

143 *MNM*, p. 408.

144 Does *ḥwzrr* "crab-apple" = *’wzir*? See: Löw, *Flora*, III, p. 246 ff.

145 Klein, *EG*, p. 115.

146 *Ibid.*, pp. 128–129.

147 *Ibid.*, p. 135.

148 For example, *ibid.*, p. 23. The equation is however, far-fetched (oral communication from Prof. Mazur).

149 Kahle, *CG*, pp. 91–92; *idem*, *ZAW*, XXXIX (1921), p. 235. The conclusions which Kahle drew from these examples concerning the gutturals are, therefore, totally invalid.

etymological *ḥ*, keeping apart those words which preserved the *h* and those words in which it was replaced by ‘.

With *h*: *'h* "brother" (app. 10 ×); *šlḥ* "he sent" (app. 8 ×); *ḥkm* "he knew" (3 ×); *ḥmr* "ass" (2 ×); *lḥm* "bread" (2 ×); *rḥmym* "mercy" (2 ×); *pṯḥ* "he opened"; *ḥy* "living"; *'nḥnn* "we"; *ḥlq* "part"; *ḥd* "one"; *ḥzh* "he saw"; *ḥwh* (written: *ḥb'*) "to tell"; *dḥl* "he feared"; *sḥḥ* "he washed (intr.)". **Total: Fifteen roots.**

With ‘: *'zr* "he returned" (app. 7×); *ṣyb'ṯ, ṣb'd* "a little bit" (3 ×); *n'ṯ* "he went down" (7×); *'yb* "he found guilty"[150]; *'wrn* "another"; *'br* "friend". **Total: Six words.**

From an initial survey, it is immediately clear that all the six words in which *ḥ* is replaced by ‘ *do not appear in the Pentateuch.* (This is the only part of the Bible which the Samaritans possess.) Of the fifteen words in which *ḥ* is not replaced by ‘, eleven are found in the Pentateuch, and of the remaining four, three are very common in Aramaic. What then is the explanation of this phenomenon? There seems to be only one explanation: In SA all *ḥet*'s became ‘, but the scribes continued to write those words which they knew from the Pentateuch with the same orthography to which they were accustomed. The same applies to the very common Aramaic words (*dḥl, ḥwh, ḥzh*) which were ingrained in the language before the linguistic change *ḥ* > ‘ took place. But words whose original orthography the scribes did not thoroughly know were written with ‘ without any restraint. As proof of this explanation, consider the following: Because of the connection with Hebrew *'ḥd*, the word *ḥd* "one" when written independently is spelled with *ḥ*. But in the phrase *ṣybḥd* "a little bit" (occurring also in GA) < *ṣyb* "fiber" + *ḥd* "one" the connection between *ḥd* and *'ḥd* was not felt, and, therefore, the scribes wrote *ṣb'd* — *ṣb'ṯ*. The spelling *trḥ* "gate" (Aramaic *tr'*) survives from the period in which the change took place. The scribes apparently thought that the original root was *trḥ* (cf. *twḥlt* — *tw'lt* "hope, expectation" in GA). The word *lwd* "alone" (< *lḥwd*) exemplifies the situation at its final stage when no remnant of the guttural remained.

This chapter is only a sample. The situation is, in fact, the same throughout the Samaritan Targum. The first stage in the loss of the gutturals was the change *ḥ* > ‘; however, the orthography has masked this change to some extent[151].

150 The same word occurs in GA; cf. *supra*, p. 71.

151 The phonetic change *ḥ* > ‘ in SA has already been noted by other scholars. See: Noldeke, *MG*, p. 58, n. 1; however, the lack of consistency has not been explained until now.

There are indications of this linguistic change also in CPA[152]. Schulthess brings the following examples: *šrḥ* — *šr'* "lasciviousness"; *šbḥ* — *šb'* "to increase in value." Add the following examples: *'wb'* (— *ḥwb'*) "bosom"[153]; *r'ṭ* (— *rḥṭ* < *rṭḥ*) "to boil"[154]; and perhaps: *ḥprwn* (— *'prwn*) "Ephron"[155.a]. Is *ḥgl* "to go around" (occurring also in GA) the same as *'gl*? In any event, it seems that this change did not encompass the whole vocabulary[156].

The source of this linguistic change seems to be in Palestine. It should, however, be noted that it apparently began several hundred years before the period under discussion, i.e. at the beginning of the Second Temple Period. The names *'nn*, *'nny*, *'nnyh* — each occurring once in the Bible in Nehemiah and Chronicles — can only be explained as variants of *ḥnn*, *ḥnny*, *ḥnnyh*[157]. It is no coincidence that nearly all the instances of these names are to be found at the beginning of the Second Temple Period — about twenty times in the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles — rarely in Jeremiah, and even less in other biblical books[158]. It is difficult to believe that the large number of occurrences of the names *ḥnn*, *ḥnny*, *ḥnnyh*, *'nny* and *'nnyh* at Elephantine is coincidental[159.b]. Did this linguistic change take place in Babylonia where the gutturals disappeared[160]?

We must, of course, assume that the names *'nn* and the like, in the Palestinian Talmud (e.g. *R. 'nn* YFG 75_{37}) and in the Gaonic period are actually *ḥnn*[161]. It is, however, clear that on the basis of only one name

152 Schulthess, *Grammatik*, p. 19, § 4.

153 *Idem*, *LS*, p. 140.

154 *Ibid.*, p. 196.

155 *Ibid.*, p. 68. It is difficult however to utilize the transcriptions of Semitic proper names in CPA, which are taken from LXX and the New Testament. Occasionally, it is clear that the translators did not know the nature of the name, but knowing that LXX could not represent the gutturals, they restored them — though not always the proper ones. There are also interchanges in the various manuscripts, e.g. *'dy* — *ḥdy* Ἀδδί (Schulthess, *LS*, p. 3); *ḥlmdm* — *'lmdm* Ἐλμαδαμ (*ibid.*, p. 64). Hebrew *'ḥyman* Ἀχιμαν appears as *ḥkymn*! (*ibid.*, p. 63); *yšy* Ἰεσσαι as *ysy'* *ibid.*, p. 78.

156 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 126, *s.v. n'm*.

157 Noth, *op. cit.* (p. 66, n. 101), p. 184, had difficulty in explaining these names and proposed a far-fetched solution.

158 See Gesenius-Buhl.

159 Cowley, *AP*, Index.

160 Noth, *op. cit.* (p. 66, n. 101), p. 254, gives examples in Akkadian transliteration.

161 Bacher, *op. cit.* (p. 71, n. 124), III, p. 547, n. 5, identifies *'nyn' br sswn* with *ḥnyn' br 'ysy* in *BR*, chap. IV (p. 28). But Ms. V reads: *'nyn'*. See Bacher, *loc. cit.*, for an additional example. In any event, these interchanges should be noted. *'nny* occurs also in Palmyrene. See: H. Chajes, 'Beitrage zur nordsemitischen Onomatologie',

no conclusion can be drawn as to the provenance of this phenomenon, since names have a tendency to detach themselves from their original source and pass over to a new area in their new form.

Indications of the Weakening of the Gutturals in Jewish Sources

According to the evidence, the change *ḥ* > ' began in Galilee at the latest at the end of the 2nd cent. C.E. (the time of R. Ḥiyya). At first, it began perhaps in a few places, in certain social classes[162], or in careless speech — or perhaps under all these conditions. In the 2nd — 3rd cents. C.E. (the time of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon and R. Levi), it was still not a general phenomenon. It was general (when?) in SA. There are indications of it in CPA. The evidence proves that ' was an independent phoneme distinct from ' (and *h*). From the 6th cent. C.E. there is clear proof that a change took place in the pronunciation of the other gutturals, especially '. The evidence comes from Jewish liturgical poetry of that period:

1. R. Eleazar ha-Qallir rhymes *ḥ* with *h* (*hr* "mountain" with *nbḥr* "chosen"; see Abraham ibn Ezra's commentary to Eccl 5:1).

2. Yannai (*Piyyute Yannai*, ed. Zulay, p. 271, l. 55) writes *hwggh* "celebrating" (= *ḥwggh*) in the *h*-line of an alphabetic acrostic poem.

3. The name of an early poet of unknown date[163] is *hdwt'* = *ḥdwt'* "joy."

4. In an anonymous *Seliḥa*[164] (penitential poem), which — according to the editor — is from the period of Yose b. Yose in Palestine, a word beginning with *ḥ* is found in a *h*-line: *hn* . . . *hlw'* . . . *ḥnwn* "behold . . .

Sitzungberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, P.-h. Klasse, CXLIII (1900), p. 36.

162 R. Aḥa informs us of differences in pronunication among different classes. Cf. *Šir ha-Širim Rabba* on the verse: *wdglw 'ly 'hbh* "And his banner over me is love" (Song 2:4): *'(mr) r(bỵ) 'ḥ' 'm h'rṣ šqwr' l'hbh 'ybh kgwn w'hbt w'ybt* "R. Aḥa said: 'An ignorant man reads 'hate' instead of 'love' by saying, for instance, *wə'ăyabtā* ('and you shall hate') instead of *wə'ahabtā* ('and you shall love') . . .'". The change may be represented as follows: *'ahabtā* > *'ă'abtā* > *'ăyabtā* (glide vowel). This phenomenon is found in YTG 17:20 *yyn ylyh* "that child," i.e. *hāhen* > *'āhen* > *'ă'en* > *'ăyen*. For *hēn, 'en*, see: Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 111. This is proof for the interchange *h* — ', but this interchange requires a separate investigation. Apparently, it is not directly connected with the problem of the gutturals.

163 See: J.N. Epstein, *Tarbiṣ*, XII (1941), p. 78, for additional examples. M. Zulay now disagrees with this identification. See: *Tarbiṣ*, XXII (1952), p. 28 ff.

164 Printed in *Mibḥar ha-šib'im* (Festschrift in Honor of Z. Schocken's Seventieth Birthday), Jerusalem 1948. This was brought to my attention by Mr. H. Yalon.

is not . . . merciful," and in the *ḥ*-line a word beginning with *h*: *ḥrpwny . . . ḥm . . . ḥšm* "they reviled me . . . they . . . the name."

5. The following words are rhymed: *tpwḥ* "apple," *tptḥ* "you will open," *tntḥ* "you will dismember," *b'yth* "in its time."[165]

6. Biblical fragments from the Cairo Geniza collected by Kahle in which the gutturals are not vocalized at all, indicating that the vocalizer did not pronounce them.[a] However, their geographic provenance is unknown, and there are no certain indications as to their date, even though Kahle's estimate seems reasonable.

Nevertheless, at first glance, we have clear indications that in a certain place in Palestine the pronunication of the gutturals was confused. Since the main cultural center was in Galilee, it may be assumed that the provenance of the above texts — liturgical poetry and biblical fragments — was Galilee.

Furthermore, Dalman collected in his grammar a number of examples of the interchange of the gutturals in the Palestinian Talmud and the Midrashim[166]. This material could be excluded on the grounds that it is due to the copyists of the texts; however, the reliable texts not only substantiate this interchange, but the variant readings in *BR* show that the scribes tried to restore that form which seemed to them to be correct, i.e. ' is often found in reliable texts instead of ', whereas in the other manuscripts ' is restored.

Examples:

' for original ': *BR*, Ms. L: *'ygwl* — Ms. V: *'ygwl*, "loaf of bread" 503; *'rbw* (= *'rbw*) (place name) 309[167]; *š'bh* "wax" 1136 (corrected or explained in the margin *š'wh*; Ms. G: *š'wwh*; in FPT 17 (Gen 35:25): *š'b'*); *qym'h* "somewhat" 461 (but p. 170: *qym'h*); *'dsndl'* (= *'d dsndl'*) "as long as the shoe (is on your foot)" 433; *'b'bwt* "vomiting" 570 — *'b'byt* 170[168]; *b'wšr* (= *b'wšr*) "with wealth" 681 (This is the reading also in Mss. LM; the other mss.: *'wšr*!); *'śrh* "ten" 683 is glossed in the margin:

165 Kahle, *CG*, p. 91 [*CG*², p. 167, n. 2]. The other examples in which *ḥ* is rhymed with ' do not constitute proof!

166 *Ibid.*, pp. 98, 99.

167 The city is mentioned with regard to the interpretation of the verse: *wh'rbym mby'ym . . . 'yr hy' bt ḥwm byyšn wšmw 'rbw* "And the ravens brought (I Kings 17:6) — It is a city in the district of Beisan, and it is called Arbu." The reading with ' is found in the better mss. L,G; but in the others: *'rbw*, with ', under the influence of the biblical verse!

168 However, the etymology of the word is unclear. See Theodor's commentary, *BR*, p. 170, and Krauss *et al.*, *AAC*, *s.v. 'bbyt*.

'šrh; *hw'yl* (= *hw'yl*) "he has derived benefit" 599; *'ybly'h* (= *'yn bly'h*) "fountain of Beliah" 308. The root *k'r* — *k'r* "to be ugly" 824–825 (8×; *k'wrym* is "corrected" twice to *k'wrym*) furnishes no proof. The root *k'r* also occurs on pp. 158, 341, 451; "corrected" to *k'r* 654. In this case it seems that Ms. V (and other reliable texts) reflect the original form, since — as Syriac shows — the ' is original. The form in TB is *k'r* and the attempts at correction derive from this fact[169].

YFL: *'dyyn* (= *'dyyn*) "still" 257_{24}; 272_{12}; 280_{24}; *mšwmd* "apostate" 274 (2×). In my opinion, it is doubtful whether *mšwmd* = *mšw'md* "baptized"[170] even though we find the spelling *mšw'm*[*d*] YFG 121_{29} (but *mšwm*[*d*], *mšwmd ib.* 285_{21}). As was noted by Bacher there are substantial reasons for rejecting this identification.

YFE: *k'wr* "ugly" 25 (5×). The forms *'ṣwt'* "kneading trough" GS 422; *'aṣbåtkōn* FPT 28 (Deut 28:17) are not entirely clear. It occurs with ' in other places (see the dictionaries), with ' in TO, but in Syriac *'ṣwt'* with '! Because of this it seems (as in the case of *k'r* — *k'r*) that the ' is original. On the other hand, this word is connected with Hebrew *'ṣyṣ* — *'ṣyṣ* "flower-pot"[171]. In any event, it is clear from Syriac that if the ' is original it became ' at an earlier period. (Where? Syriac generally preserves original '. Is this a borrowing from another dialect?)

YFG: *'dyyn* (= *'dyyn*) "still" 213_{28}, 226_{35}, *šå'ědīn* 213_{28}; *qym'h* (= *qym'h*) "somewhat" 136_{18}.

The ' disappears completely: An interesting example is YFE 124_4: *k'ynyyn* (*nyst*) *'yst 'wrz* "as to the matter of the rice dough." The scribe did not hear the ', and, therefore, he attached the *n* of the preceding word and wrote *nyst* which he then corrected to *'yst*. YFG: *ywšw* "Joshua" 74_{34} (= *yhwšw'*, *ywšw'*)[172]; *R. yešw* (sic!) *drwmyyh* "R. Jeshu, the south-

169 *Ibid.*, *s.v. k'r*; Brockelmann, *LS*², *s.v. k'r*. The material in Ms. V, therefore, changes the state of affairs as recorded by Ginsberg, *MGWJ*, LXVII (1934), pp. 10–11. It seems doubtful that *k'r* (*k'r*) = *'kr* (H) "to trouble," but it is possible that *'kr* influenced the spelling of *k'r* in TB. Nevertheless, even if Ginsberg is correct, the fact that the form in Syriac is *k'r* shows that this is not a process which took place in Galilee. This word requires a separate study.

170 This is the opinion of R. Hai Gaon, quoted in Kohut, *AC*, *s.v. šmd*. Are we dealing here with a popular etymology?

171 Brockelmann, *LS*², *s.v.*; S. Fraenkel, *Die aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen*, Leiden 1886, p. 69. The explanation given by Kohut, *AC*, *s.v. 'ṣwwt'*, is rejected by B. Geiger, *AAC*, *s.v.*

172 The *ed. pr.* reads: *ywsh bryh dR. tnḥwm dkpr 'gyn* "Yose the son of R. Tanḥum of Kefar Agin" (Y. Sab. 5b); but in the parallel, *BR*, Ms. V, p. 45: *R. yhwš'* "R. Joshua." Therefore, the reading in YFG is correct and goes back to *ywšw* or something similar.

erner." The form *z'yyh* (= *zyy'h*) (f.sg. participle of *zw'*) "trembling" *BR*, Ms. V, p. 767, belongs here. It is clear that the scribe did not pronounce the ' and added it in the wrong place (cf. the examples *supra*, § 2C "*Kětib* and *Qĕre*"). *'wšy'* (= *'wš'y'*) "Oshaya" is found in a Geniza fragment[173] from the Byzantine Period.[a]

Against these are the following spellings from YFG: *twqy'* "he blows (the shofar)" 116_5; *bšmy' tpylh* "in (the benediction) 'He hears a prayer' " 174_7; *šmyyḥ*(!) "happy" 169_6; etc.

ḥ for original *ḥ*: Ms. V — *mhwltk* (= *mḥwltk*) "your sieve" 972 (see the dictionaries; root *nḥl*); however, *nṣtwwh* (= *nṣtwwḥ*) "it was called" 901 may simply be an error; *ṣḥy* "thirsty" 1264 is more exact than *ṣhy* (see the dictionaries); *mhyyn* (= *mḥyyn*) "from life" YFE 24_6; *mškh* (= *mškḥ*) "he finds" YFG 139_6 is perhaps an error.

' — h: The interchange *' — h* requires a special study. This is apparently not connected with the loss of the gutturals. One interesting example should be mentioned: *mh hnn qyymyn* "What is the case?" GS 443. Cf. also *km'wt* (= *kmhyn*) "mushrooms" *BR*, Ms. V, p. 791.

' for original *ḥ*: *b'pty* (= *bḥpty*) "in my bosom" *BR*, Ms. V, p. 883 (see the dictionaries. The root *ḥpt* occurs also in *BR*, p. 961).[a]

' for original *'*: Ms. V — *'yl'wn* "they tired themselves" 524 (root *l'h*). This is also the case in CPA,[174] where there are clear signs of the weakening of the gutturals; *by'pyl* (= *b'pyl*) "in the autumn" 659 (see the dictionaries). The word is biblical. The word *'rsth* (= *'rsth*) "you have betrothed" in *Piyyute Yannai* (ed. Zulay, p. 33, note), shows how careful one must be. This word is the same as biblical *'rś* "to betroth," but Arabic *'arūs* means "husband" (see Köhler-Baumgartner *s. v.*). According to this we must assume that a real linguistic change *' > '* took place here[175].

The spelling *'r'm* (= *'rym*) "he raised" FPT 34 (Gen 29:11) should be mentioned here (There is no certain example of the weakening of the gutturals in FPT; cf. *'ṣbtkwn supra*), since spellings of this type — i.e. in

173 Mann, *op. cit.* (p. 60, n. 71), I, p. 15, n. 4.

174 Schulthess, *Grammatik*, p. 19. The fact that this phenomenon occurs in the same word in two dialects shows that it is a real sound shift, and not just an orthographic variant. See: Gesenius-Buhl, *s.v. l'h*.

175 In my opinion, this shows that the word is an Aramaism in Arabic (if the late copyist was not influenced by Arabic!). With regard to *' > '* I do not think that this was caused by the *r* (See: J.J. Hess, *Zeitschrift fur Semistik*, II (1924), p. 219 ff.) — cf. *'rys–'rs* — but it was the result of popular etymology (the desire to differentiate). Cf. also: *'rś* "bed" (Song 1:16).

II–*w* verbs — are found in Pseudo-Jonathan[176] and in SA[177]. For Pseudo-Jonathan and SA I would propose the following explanation: The ' stands for '. Thus: *q'm* = *qå'em* "standing." This orthography was used since *q'm* was apt to be read: *qåm* "he stood." In SA, ' is widely used as a *mater lectionis*. (This is also found in reliable Rabbinic texts.) On analogy to the participle this spelling passed over to the perfect and the imperfect. (This is similar to Dalman's explanation.) The problem is complicated by FPT where — as was pointed out above — no trace of the confusion of the gutturals is to be found. With regard to the spelling *mt'klyn* "they are consumed" *BR*, Ms. V, p. 780 (so in some mss.; others: *mt'klyn*), cf. L. Ginzberg's discussion of the word[178].

In general, it cannot be claimed that these spellings reflect the language of the scribes, even though a few cases are probably due to them. There are, however, cases where such a claim is hardly possible. For example, the word *pry* "to run" in the Palestinian Talmud is not derived from *prḥ* (so Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 99), but from *pry'* "quickly." This word occurs in TO (see the dictionaries) and in the Palestinian Talmud spelled *pry'* (Kid. I, 59a bot.)[179], and without the ' in the form *pwry* (Sheb. 33c, top)[180]. A new verb *pry* "to run, hurry" was formed from this adverb. *pry* "quickly" is also found in SA[181]: *'tynw lydk bpry* "We came to you quickly." It is improbable that the scribes would have changed an original **pr'h* "she hurries" to *pryyh* by eliminating the ', or **pr'yn* to the common *pryy* "they hurry."

With regard to *h*, there is also epigraphical evidence: *ty l'* (= *thy lh*) *brkth* "Let there be a blessing for him," occurs in an inscription in the synagogue at Capernaum.[182] The engraver did not pronounce the *h*, and therefore he erred. He actually pronounced *tē* instead of *tĕhē*. This explanation is supported by YFE 130_{10}: *'yn tpšyṭh* (= *thy pšyṭh*) *lk* "If

176 Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 318, also lists an example with '.

177 E.g. Num 23:17 (ed. Nutt): *q'"m* "standing." The ' represents the long vowel [*ē*] (but in most cases: *q'm*, e.g. Num 22:23; 31). From such participial forms, the ' was carried over to the perfect, e.g. *wq'mw* "and they stood" (Num 22:14).

178 *Op. cit.* (p. 70, n. 122), p. 91.

179 Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 214 (top).

180 The form with *w* is correct. (For the spelling *pr'* among others, see: Schulthess, *LS*, p. 163.) For an indication of the equation *pry'* = *pry*, see Lieberman, *Tarbiz*, III (1932), p. 206; however, no emendation is necessary.

181 Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, 'A Samaritan Inscription of the XIth Century', *Bulletin of the Jewish Palestinian Exploration Society*, XII (1945–46), p. 78 (Hebrew).

182 *SY*, p. 94.

this will be clear to you[183, a]." The error *l'* for *lh* "to him" shows that *leh* was already pronounced *lē*. Cf. also: *t'h lh brkth* "May it be a blessing for him" in an inscription in the synagogue of Gush Halab[184]. The spelling *t'h* testifies to the engraver's confusion due to the difference between his pronunciation and the historical orthography.

It is well known that there are Midrashic interpretations which point to the confusion of the gutturals.[b] It is, of course, clear that as long as the exegetical methodology has not been studied from a linguistic point of view[185] these interpretations in themselves cannot be relied upon. Here are a few examples from *BR*, Ms. V: *h* — *ʿ*: *wyhllw 'wth* — *mtʿlh whwlkt* "'And they praised her' (Gen 12:15) — Higher and higher prices were offered for her" 385; *h* — *Ø*: *rhbym* "false gods" (Ps 40:8) — *rbbym* "tens of thousands" 1088; *ḥ* — *'*: *l' yḥrwk* "He will not catch" (Prov 12:27) — *y'rwk* "?" 753 (This word is also interpreted as *y'ḥr* "he will delay." Does this mean *ḥ* — *k*?); *ḥ* — *h*: *'ḥr* "after" — *hrhwry dbrym* "schemes, plans" 428, 614, 1063, etc.; *'* — *ʿ*: *tʿbd* "you will work" (Gen 27:40) — *t'bd* "you will be lost" 762; *ʿ* — *ḥ*: *wyʿtr* "And he prayed" (Gen 25:21) — *ḥwtr* "breaking in" 681; *ʿ* — *h*: *ʿśw* "Esau" — *h' šw'* "behold, a worthless one" 692; *'* — *ʿ*: *h'rṣ* "the land" (Gen 10:11) — *ʿṣh* "advice" 374. (For another example where *r* is disregarded in the exposition, cf. *dwkym* "their roaring" (Ps 93:3) — *drk ym* "the way of the sea" 33–34.)

By assuming that a two-stage linguistic process took place —*ḥ* > *ʿ* and then *ʿ* > *'* — we may understand the following Midrashic explanation: *R. šmʿwn bn lqyš 'm(r) šhypk 't hgzyrh wlpm kn qryyn lh 'trh dhpk 'drh* "R. Simeon b. Lakish says: 'He overturned the decree. Therefore, they call it "the shovel" because it overturns the grain in the barn'" *BR* 681, according to Ms. V. It seems that the first stage was: *bglyl' qwryn lḥtr'* *'tr'* (So *Debarim Rabba*, ed. Lieberman, p. 1). When the *ʿ* of *'tr'* (< *ḥtr'*) became *'* the play on words *dhpyk 'drh* was added[186].

The following dispute regarding the correct reading in the Mishnah is probably the first indication of the weakening of the gutturals — or at any rate of a penetration from some dialect in which the weakening

183 Cf. *ibid.*, n. 10, for additional material, and also *deyē* (= *dyh'*) "that it should be" YFG 172[14].

184 *SY*, p. 29.

185 A. Malamat quotes several examples in his article in *Lešonénu*, XVI (1947), p. 151, and especially p. 159. On *ḥtr* — *'tr*, p. 152, cf. our discussion.

186 The explanation given by Kohut, *AC*, *s.v.*, is rejected by Krauss *et al.*, *AC*, *s.v.* *'tr* (II).

had taken place, such as the dialect of R. Eliezer b. Jacob (See *supra*, p. 75, and the dialect of 1QIs[a]!): *m'bryn 'w m'bryn* "defining Sabbath limits" (B. Erub. 53a; Y. *ib.* V, 22b). Similarly: *'kwzw — 'kwzw* "buttocks" (See *supra*, p. 74); *'wmmym — 'wmmym* "growing dim"; *'ydyhm — 'ydyhm* "their festivals"; *y'wtw — y'wtw* "they will derive benefit." Also: *gmy'h — gmy'h* "full draught"; (*gr'ynyn — gr'ynyn*(?) "seeds"; *y'zq — yzq* (*y'zq*?) "Yazek"); *m'mṣyn — m'mṣyn* "closing the eyes")[187]. Most of these questions were posed in Babylonia. However, there is at least one example which testifies to this phenomenon at a very early period. The word *ṭm, ṭmy* "bone, bones" (Hebrew: *'ṣm — 'ṣmwt*) dropped the ' in GA, CPA, SA, and already in the Uzziah inscription: *ṭmy 'wzyh* "the bones of Uzziah."[188]

The sum total of the loss of the gutturals as it is reflected in the actual vocabulary is not great. Just the opposite is true: Their number is quite small. The indications, however, are certain. The small number of cases raises the question of the distribution and the penetration of the weakening of the gutturals. It is difficult to believe that if they were ingrained and widespread their number would be so small. One recalls Samaritan texts where these indications appear throughout. Nevertheless, at first glance, there is material which provides convincing proof for those who claim that the gutturals were completely confused, viz. the story quoted above from the Babylonian Talmud of the Galilean pronunciation (*supra*, p. 68). Taken at its face value, it indicates the state of affairs at least in the 6th cent. C.E.! However, the matter does not end here.

Place Names as Proof

There is one set of linguistic material which did not pass through the hands of the copyists and is therefore more trustworthy than all the literary material, viz. place names. This material proves unequivocally that in most places in Palestine — at any rate among certain classes of

187 See in detail: Epstein, *MNM*, pp. 8-12; 183-185; 280-281; 405–407. *'md — 'md* "to estimate" (*ibid.*, p. 1227) does not belong here. As I have shown in *Lĕšonénu*, X (1939), p. 295 ff., this word derives from Akkadian *emēdu*. The spelling *h'myd*, never existed, but was introduced by the scribes who were familiar with the Hebrew root *'md* "to stand." The interchange '-' never occurs in this root. This shows that ' replaced ' and not *vice versa*.

188 For GA, see: Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 99; for CPA and SA, see: Schulthess, *LS*, p. 144; for the Uzziah inscription, *Tarbiz*, II (1931), p. 293, and Epstein's remarks, *ibid.*

the population — the pronunication of the gutturals was known at least until the Arab conquest — and probably afterwards. It is clear that if the Arabs had not heard the gutturals, they would not be found in present-day place names. An investigation of place names in Galilee has shown — according to the following table — that 80–100 place names were preserved without the loss of their gutturals.

The following is a list of historical place names and their present-day Arabic form[189]:

Original ' = ' today: *b'r šb'* "Khirbet Abu as-Saba'"; *byt m'wn* "Tell Mā'un"; *byt 'nt* "Beit 'Aynūn" A 267; *bq'* "Biqā'" *g'twn* "Khirbet Ja'thūn" 140; *ṭb'wn* "Ṭab'ūn" 209; *ybl'm* "Bel'ame" A 62; *yzr"l* "Zer'īn" 113; *yn'm* "Tell an-Nā'me" A 18[190]; *mr'št'* "Bar'āshīt" 140; *'bdwn* " 'Abdūn" A 233; *'twš(')* "Khirbet 'Aṭṭeshī" 135; *'yylbw* " 'Aylābūn" *SY*, p. 165; *'ywn* " 'Ayyun" A 154; *'yn bwl* " 'Ayn Ibl" 133; *'yn tynh* " 'Ayn Attīn" 121; *'yyt'* " 'Aytha" 140; *'yytlw* " 'Aylūth" 85; YFG $287_{1:2}$ (also *hyytlw* in TB. Is the original form *ḥyytlw*? See above, p. 70); *'kbr'* " 'Aqbara" *SY*, p. 117; *'kw* " 'Akkā" A 235; *'mq'* " 'Amqa"; 136[191]; *'nm* " 'Anīn" A 62; *kpr 'qbyh* "Khirbet 'Uqēbe" 131 (mentioned also in the e'-Ḥammeh inscription, no. 2, l. 2); *'rb* " 'Arab" *SY*, p. 216, n. 2; *špr'm* "Shefā 'Amr" *SY*, p. 155; *t'nk* "Ti'innik" A 473; *tyr'n* "Tur'ān" 88, n. 7. Doubtful cases: *'zryh* "al-'Azayr" 125. It is accepted that "aṭ-Ṭayyibe," south of Ein Dor, is *'prh* "Ophrah" in the territory of Gideon (p. 403). Since *'ifrīt* is the name of a demon in Arabic, the name was changed. In any event, the name "aṭ-Ṭayyibe" furnishes proof for the existence of ' at the time of the Arab conquest.

Original *ḥ* = present-day *ḥ*: *'ḥlb* "Khirbet al-Maḥālib" A 384; *byt lḥm* "Bayt Laḥm" *SY*, p. 15; *ḥbry'* "Ḥuwwāra" 126; *ḥwṭr'* " 'Ayn Ḥuṭra" A 65; *ḥyph* "Ḥayfa" A 347; *ḥmt* "al-Ḥammām A 65; *ḥnwt'*

189 For obvious reasons, I have tried to list mainly place names — contemporary with the above-mentioned period — from Galilee and the immediate surrounding territories, until the mountains of Samaria. The numbers after the names refer to the pages of Klein, *EG*. Occasionally — especially when the Arabic name is not given there — I have quoted from *SY*. The material from the Bible and from the Egyptian inscriptions has been cited from Abel, *GP*, II, Paris 1938 (= A). This material — as much as is included — may be found in Avi-Yonah, *GHEY*, through the index. Even though I have not striven for completeness, I believe that I have listed practically all of the *certain material*.

190 This city is mentioned in Egyptian — but not in biblical — sources; similarly, others listed in A.

191 In *SY*, only *kpr 'm'wqw* is given (listed in Klein, *EG*, p. 51). This is the same place even though the material quoted there is not identical.

"Ḥānūtha" 159; *ymwḥ* "Yānūḥ" A 354; *kpr 'ḥym — nḥwm* "Tel Ḥūm" 39 (mentioned in the el-Ḥammeh inscription, no. 2);[a] *kpr ḥytyy'* "Ḥittīn al-Qadīm" 123; *'yn ḥṣwr* "Khirbet Ḥasīre A 65 (See *ibid.*); *rḥwb* "Tell ar-Raḥīb" A 433, n. 4; *ym' šl ḥylt'* "al-Ḥūle" (see S. Klein, *Ereṣ Yisra'el*, p. 14).

Perhaps: *ḥršt hgwym* "al-Ḥārithiyye" A 21. The name *ḥwṣpyt* which is transcribed in the Crusader Period "Caphrahusepth"[192] is doubtful, since the transcription "ch" could also reflect an original *ḫ* (This seems probable) or even *h*.

Original *h* = *h* today: *hrm* "Jebel Haramūn" A 65.[b]

Original *ḥ* = ' today: Biblical *'nḥrt* — Rabbinic *n'wrn* "an-Nā'ūra" 115; *ḥnnyh — 'nn* "Kafr 'Anān" 129[193] (*BR*, Ms. V, p. 235: *ḥnn*) = *hyny* in TB (cf. *supra*, p. 70); *ḥwsyph* " 'Usufya" 135. On the name *'pryym — ḥpryym*, cf. *infra*. — Near Galilee in Transjordan, north of the River Yabbok (the "Arabia" of the Midrash; see *supra*, p. 71, n. 124) is found *ḥmtn — 'mtn* " 'Amatta" *SY*, p. 48 (In the Middle Ages: *'l'mt'ny* "the "Amatite" (i.e. a person from *ḥmtn*); see *SY*, vol. II, p. 9)[194].

Is *'q'l zytwn hsmwkh lmdynt ṣpt* " *'q'l zytwn* which is close to the city of Safed" = *ḥq'l*[195]?

Original *h* = ' today: Biblical *nhlwl* — Rabbinic *mhlwl* "Ma'lūl" 126[196].

Original ' which has disappeared (or has become *y*, etc.)[197]: *byt š'rym* has not survived (today "Sheikh Abrēik") 82; *ypy'* "Yāfa" 48[198]; *yqn'm*

192 S. Klein, *Beiträge zur Geographie und Geschichte Galiläas*, Leipzig 1909, p. 70 *idem, MS*, p. 21.

193 The form with ' is also found in the Geniza. See: *SY*, II, *s.v.* The document is apparently from the 11th cent. C.E.

194 Kampffmeyer, *op. cit.* (p. 64, n. 90) lists three place names in which *ḥ* > ' and attributes the change to Arabic. Since he did not utilize Rabbinic sources at all, he did not know that this linguistic change — as shown by the names *'mtn–ḥmtn*, *'nnyh–ḥnn*, etc. — preceded the Arab conquest of Palestine. Cf. what was said above on this change in Rabbinic sources.

195 Mann, *op. cit.* (p. 60, n. 71), II, p. 204.

196 In *SY*, the form *mhlwl* is apparently a mistake.

197 S. Krauss, *ZAW*, XXVIII (1908), p. 24, is of the opinion that *gwbt'* = *gwb't'* (e.g. *gwbt šmw* "Gobath in its name" *BR*, Ms. V, p. 327). But since besides *gwpth* (= *gwbth*) YI·G 138_{28} we also find *gwbbth dṣypwryn* (see *SY*, *s.v.*), it seems that the root is *gbb*.

198 The ' had apparently already disappeared in the time of Josephus. Spellings such as *'Ιαφα*, etc., in Josephus testify to this. See: Schlatter, *op. cit.* (p. 62, n. 82), p. 63.

"Tell Kammūn" A 365; *n'ym* "Kafr Nayn" 36; *'yn dwr* "Endōr" A 316; *qsrw'* "Kisra" A 14; *glbw'* "Jalbūn" *GHEY*, p. 144.[a] But *šm'n* (A 14; in an Egyptian list) = *šm'wnyh, symwnyy'* (in the Talmud) "Sammūniyye" 12. apparently does not prove anything. Here the Greek name Σίμων replaced the Hebrew form of the name *šm'wn* just as was the case in the personal name. Doubtful cases: *'wzy'l* 125; *gl'd* 113; *tn'm* 114.

ḥ which disappeared (or became *y*): *ḥqwq* "Yāqūq" 122; *mmlyḥ* "Khirbet Mimle" 120. (The form *mml'* occurs already in the Amoraic Period, e.g. *BR*, Ms. V, p. 630; but *rby ywsy mmlwḥyy'* 124 is also found.) A doubtful case is *ḥprym* — *'prym*. According to Klein (SY, p. 111) this is present-day "Khirbet Fariye." But Mazar (Maisler) disputes this identification, since there are no archeological remains there (See A 343 and Avi-Yonah, *GHEY*, p. 134)[199]. Even if we accept the identification of *ḥprym* with "Fariye," the loss of ' seems to be due to the same reason that *'prh* became "aṭ-Ṭayyibe" (*'ifrīt* is the name of a demon in Arabic; see A 61). *ḥbrḥ* "Abrīkha" A 14 cannot serve as an example since the second *ḥ* still exists. This indicates that a different cause should be sought here for the loss of the first *ḥ*.

Original ' = *h* today: *'wš'* "Khirbet al-Hūsa" SY, p. 3.

Thus, more than forty place names have preserved the gutturals, most of them in their original form. There are approximately nine certain cases of the loss of a guttural. If we add to these the doubtful cases their number is not more than a quarter of the cases where the guttural was preserved. Even more interesting is the fact that some names appear in the sources without gutturals, but today they contain these sounds: Biblical *'bṣ* is today " 'Ayn al-Ḥabūs" or "al-'Abūs" A 62. (Is this identification certain?); *kpr symyy* — *sym'y* today "Kafr Smi' " 156 (*GHEY*, p. 135: Kafr Simi'a); *py mṣwbh* (*m'ṣwbh*) "Khirbet Ma'ṣūba"[200] 159 (*GHEY*, p. 149, reads: "Maṣūb", and so also in the index. This is apparently a printing error, since the form "Ma'ṣūb" is given also on maps); *ytyr* "Ya'tīr" 140; *'wlm* " 'Ulam" *SY*, p. 173; *'blyn* " 'Iblīn" *SY*, p. 1; *'yn* (*'yn*) *ttyyh* " 'Ayn Attīn" *BR*, p. 268[201].

199 The material is collected in Dalman, *SS*, p. 219. But in the second reference, read: Tosephta, instead of: Mishnah. See: I. S. Horowitz, *Palestine and the Adjacent Countries*, Vienna 1923, *s.v. ḥprym*, n. 4 (Hebrew).

200 From *pwm' ṣyb'* in the Tosephta (*SY*, *s.v. 'kw*, no. 33).

201 This is missing in Ms. V where there is a blank space. In the margin of Ms. L *'ntynyh* "one from 'Ain Teina"; see, *SY*, p. 117, *s.v. 'ntwn'* Cf. also *R. hwn' 'ntynyh*, YFG 84$_{15}$.

There are examples also in reliable texts: *'rbw BR*, Ms. V, p. 150 "Arabûne" *GHEY*, p. 144[202]; *šb* in Rabbinic sources is present-day "Sha'ib" *SY*, p. 154, reads (apparently incorrectly?) "Sa'ab" Avi-Yonah, also *GHEY*, p. 136, gives "Sha'ab"). Is *R Pzr Šwrybwr BR*, Ms. V, p. 914, from this place? (For the interchange *b* — *w*, cf. *supra*, p. 16, *hbrj* — *hwwrj*.) Perhaps also *kpr s'ṣ'y* "Khirbet Ṣa'ṣa'" *GHEY*, p. 134; however, the reading is doubtful. See *SY*, p. 95; *'mtw BR*, Ms. V, p. 387[204], in Transjordan opposite Jericho is today "Ayn al-Ḥamâm."[205]

What is the explanation of this phenomenon? There are two possible solutions: 1) ' became ' in Arabic. This has parallels in other parts of Palestine, e.g. *'šqlwn* " 'Asqalân" *SY*, p. 8; *'wnw* "Kafr 'Âna" *GHEY*, p. 109; 2) The ' was never lost in the place name in the first place, but in the *dialect of the writer* it became either' [206] or disappeared. *'blym* = "Ibillin" points to the first possibility. (*'âbel* as a place name occurs in the Bible.[207]) *'rbw* " 'Arab" indicates the second possibility (*'rb* is found as a place name.) Most likely both factors were involved.

The above list shows that the gutturals were apt to be affected in any position in the word. Even though unaffected gutturals are found in word-final position, it is likely that this position was particularly vulnerable.[208] In my opinion, an indication of this is the name *mmlyḥ*. During the period when the place was called *mml'*, the *nisba*-form was *mmlwḥy'* (*mmlyḥy'*) *BR*, Ms. V, p. 408 (erasures in the text). In word-final position other consonants besides the gutturals were vulnerable. Instead of *qlyl* "a little bit," the form *qly* is found in *BR*, p. 521 (according to Mss. VL). It is clear that there is no error here. This is proved by the following passage from *Wayyikra Rabba* (ed. M. Margulies), chap. 34, p. 789): *wyṣbṭ lh qly ḥqlyl ṣ'yr br'šy 'ṣb'wtyw* " 'And he passed he rparched corn' "

202 Because of the present-day form of the name, it is certain that the form *'rbw* with *w* (and not *y*) is the correct one.

203 In *SY*, p. 152, s.v. *Šḥ*, the editor did not take into account the reading of Ms. V and hesitatingly considered this person to come from *ṣ'* in Transjordan.

204 As was noted above, this is an addition of the corrector in a blank space. The name today is " 'Ain el-Hamâm", cf. *infra*, p. 94, for place names deriving from the root *ḥmm*.

205 B. Maisler (Mazar), *Tarbiz*, XVIII (1948), p. 62.

206 In most instances ' is used in this case. Occasionally it was crossed out by the copyists who thought that it was just a *mater lectionis*.

207 Klein, *MS*, p. 40.

208 Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 60 — following Kampffmeyer — states that the Arabs did not hear word-final gutturals.

(Ruth 2:14) — A little, a small quantity at the tips of his fingers." See Theodor's commentary on *BR*, p. 521.

The above list also informs us as to the time of this phenomenon. It is characteristic that in the "*Baraitha* of the Twenty-Four Priestly Watches" — approximately the 2nd cent. C.E. (*SY*, p. 162) — the form *mmlyḥ* is still found, but afterwards, the form is *mml'*. On the other hand, it is possible that already in the time of Josephus, the ' of *ypy'* was lost. The fact that *ḥpryym* of the Mishnah is *'pryym* in the Tosephta and in the Talmud is most interesting. *kpr ḥnnyh* appears as *'nn* in the time of the Talmud. As Prof. Mazar points out to me, *kpr 'wtny* (*'wtn'y*) is still transliterated in the 2nd cent. C.E. as *καπαρκοτνεῖ*[209]. All this indicates that the linguistic change *ḥ* > ' took place in the 2nd — 3rd cents. C.E. There are practically no fluctations between *ḥ* and *h* in Palestinian texts[210].

Conclusions

From the previous list it may be unequivocally concluded that in most places in Galilee (and it seems also in the rest of Palestine) the inhabitants were able to pronounce the gutturals. Kahle's opinion that at the time of the Arab conquest of Palestine the Jews were unable to pronounce them but learned them from the Arabs and consequently — according to him — that the entire reading tradition of words containing gutturals goes back only to the Arab Period, is therefore completely refuted.

There is explicit proof that at least the ' and *ḥ* were still pronounced during Jerome's time.[a] He says[211] that the Jews belittled the Christians for their inaccurate pronunications "especially of the aspirates and of certain letters which should be pronounced with a guttural roughness (*rasura gulae*) . . . So it came about that for *Rahel* they said *Rachel*, for *Jeriho Jericho*, for *Hebron Chebron*, for *Seor* (= *z'wr* "small") *Segor*." It is thus clear that he is referring to *ḥ* and ' which the Jews could pronounce but the (most likely Hellenized) Christians could not. This is explicit proof for the existence of the gutturals in the pronunication of of the Jews. Since on the other hand Jerome testifies to the loss of the gutturals, this points to a solution of the contradictions: The testimony refers only to the transcriptions of LXX and to the pronunciation of the

209 See in detail *supra*, p. 47.

210 But *byt yrḥ BR*, Ms. V, p. 1267 (2×) occurs also in the form *btrḥ* 1182 (*bētīraḥ* < *bēt 'īraḥ* [cf. *'yd–yd supra*, p. 25] < *bēt yeraḥ*). The form *'ryḥ* derives from this.

211 F. Suttcliffe, 'Jerome's Pronunication of Hebrew', *Biblica*, XXIX (1948), p. 120.

Christians. It also points out the way to explain the phenomenon of the loss of the gutturals in general (See *infra*).

How can this fact be reconciled with the facts reflected in both Jewish liturgical poetry and in the orthography of reliable texts? There are several possible explanations. On the one hand, it may be assumed that the texts passed through the hands of people living in areas where the gutturals were lost. On the other hand, it may be assumed — and this is quite natural — that a dialect mixture had begun to take place, or at least individual words from dialects which had lost the gutturals may have begun to penetrate. In the final analysis, the total number of examples in reliable texts is relatively small, and they are often the same words (cf. *'dyyn!*). In this respect even the liturgical poetry does not prove anything regarding the language of its authors. Perhaps when the poet needed, for example, a *h* for a *ḥ*, either for a rhyme or for an alphabetic acrostic, he did not hesitate to employ them, *since this pronunciation occurred in certain areas.* This is only a case of *licentia poetica.* Similarly, one cannot learn from the poetry of Bialik that he pronounced *š* as *s* — as do the Lithuanian Jews[212] — even though he used the two as a forced rhyme. Thus, one cannot learn from the few examples of the interchange and loss of the gutturals in Yannai's poetry as to his pronunciation. Even the biblical fragments which Kahle collected which are completely vocalized except for the gutturals just prove the otherwise known fact that there were places in Palestine where the inhabitants were unable to pronounce the gutturals. In light of the above discussion, these cannot prove under any circumstances that this was the case in *all* of Palestine.

Perhaps the matter is even simpler. We should ask ourselves the following question: What caused the loss of the gutturals? In Mandaic and in Babylonian Aramaic this was caused by the Akkadian substrate. Brockelmann[213] attributes the confusion of the gutturals in the whole Semitic

212 M. Altbauer, *Gilyonot*, XVIII (1945–46), pp. 244–245. Other "Lithuanianisms" are mentioned there.

213 *GVG*, I, p. 126. This does not mean that we should look for foreign influence in every instance where this occurred. In the South Arabian inscriptions from Hadramaut, ' is sometimes written for '. See: M. Höfner, *Altsüdarabische Grammatik*, Leipzig 1943, pp. 12–17. The same applies to modern Mehri. See: W. Leslau, Review of M. Höfner, *op. cit.*, *JAOS*, LXXIX (1949), p. 98: "In fact, Semitic ' becomes ' in Mehri." In the dialect of the Tayyi' tribe, there are examples of ' > '. See: Rabin, *op. cit.* (p. 70, n. 123), p. 201q. The area of this tribe apparently bordered on Iraq and because of this fact the name of the tribe in the form *ṭyy*" became the generic term for Arabs among the Babylonian Jews, the Syrians, and the Persians (*ibid.*, p. 193). This inter-

speaking area to foreign influence. It seems to me, that here the phenomenon may only be explained as being due to Greek influence. There is no need to recount here the strength of Greek influence in the whole Middle East from the time of Alexander the Great until the Arab conquest. Evidence for this powerful influence is to be found in the large number of Greek loanwords in Aramaic, Syriac, Arabic, Coptic, etc. It is also well known how great this influence was on the Jews. R. Judah the Prince even said: *b'rṣ yśr'l lšwn swrsy lmh lšwn qwdš 'w lšwn ywnyt* "Why use the Syriac (i.e. Aramaic) language in Palestine? Either Hebrew (lit. the holy tongue) or Greek!" (B. B.Kam. 82b; Soṭa 49b). He was thus willing to replace Palestinian Aramaic with Greek. S. Lieberman in his book *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (New York, 1942), has pointed out the depth and extent of Greek influence both on the scholars and on the common people. If we hear a report about the Jews of Caesarea who recited the *Shema* (a short prayer) in Greek (Y. Soṭa 21b), this means that there was a city in *Palestine* in the 4th cent. C.E. (the time of R. Levi b. Ḥaitha) where the knowledge of Hebrew (and Aramaic) was so low that the people were unable to recite even the *Shema* in Hebrew. This shows how great the influence of Greek was in places which were centers of Hellenistic culture.

Greek has neither *ḥ* nor *ʿ*. A Greek did not pronounce the gutturals and probably did not make an effort to do so. Because of the natural imitation of the ruling Greek or Hellenized class, it is clear that when the local Semitic inhabitants spoke to them, they also tried not to pronounce the gutturals. This was likely to begin in the main with place names (as far as these had remained Semitic) and with individual words which had passed into Greek. Just as the Greeks did not pronounce the place names in their Semitic form[214], so it seems that when dealing with the ruling class not only the philhellenes but also the common people would not pronounce them in their Semitic form. Similarly, during the British Mandate of Palestine, when an Arab clerk spoke to an Englishman he did not say Ghazza but Gazza, and a Jewish clerk would not pronounce it as 'Azza but Aza. This opened the way for a "cultured and refined"

change is also attributed to the ancient Ḥijaz dialect and is found even today. (To be sure, in Tihāma Yemenite; cf. especially *ibid.*, p. 127e and the preceding and following paragraphs.) Especially, if the last examples are certain, it would be difficult to imagine foreign influence.

214 Concerning them, Jerome also complains that they could not properly pronounce Aramaic. See: Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 59.

pronunciation, i.e. a pronunciation without the gutturals[215]. The inhabitants of Caesarea were certainly unable to pronounce the gutturals, since they did not even know Hebrew (and probably also not Aramaic)[216]. But between people such as the inhabitants of Caesarea and a Jew who knew Hebrew there were certainly many intermediate levels. There was probably a level which knew how to speak and write Aramaic (and Hebrew), but which in imitation of Greek and under the influence of its Greek vernacular had lost its ability to pronounce the gutturals to some extent. Jerome's description of the differences in pronunciation between the Jews and the Christians quoted above supports this theory[217].

Additional support for the theory that the main factor in the matter is Greek influence comes from an above-mentioned *Baraitha* (*supra*, p. 69). Of the three cities mentioned — Beisan, Haifa, and Tibon — whose inhabitants were incapable of pronouncing the gutturals properly, the first was one of the cities of the Hellenized Decapolis. Haifa situated on the Mediterranean coast, certainly had a Greek (or Hellenized) population. Unfortunately, nothing is known of Tibon.

Additional Evidence

At another opportunity[a] I intend to deal extensively with Jerusalem and to show that this process took place there also (The Dead Sea Scrolls). Perhaps it is no coincidence that in several places — in Jerusalem and in the surrounding area — this process also took place. *šilo'aḥ* is *Σιλωάμ*

215 I found a good illustration of this in the *Times Literary Supplement*. In the "Letters to the Editor" column of the newspaper there was a dispute on the question of T.E. Lawrence's proficiency in Arabic. The question was finally settled by a letter written by Lawrence himself and republished in the issue of July 13, 1951, p. 437 (Published originally in *T.E. Lawrence to his Biographer Robert Graves*, Faber and Faber, 1938): ". . . and my teachers were my servants, who were too respectful to go on reporting my mistakes to me. *They found it easier to learn my Arabic than to teach me theirs.*" This was apparently the relationship which the Semitic public servants showed to their Greek or Hellenized bosses.

216 Because the two languages are closely related, there is no reason to believe that they knew Aramaic. Their knowledge of Hebrew was so weak that they had to recite the *Shema* in Greek (and not even in Aramaic).

217 Actual parallels to this phenomenon abound. A Jew from Eastern Europe who acquired German customs in Germany often tried to change his "ugly" Polish accent when praying to the "refined" German one. When I taught in a seminary for foreign teachers in the Summer of 1950, I had to explain to one teacher, an Oriental Jew from North Africa, that he should continue to pronounce ' and *ḥ* carefully. He innocently thought — because of what he had learned from his Ashkenazic teachers — that his accent was neither nice nor correct.

in LXX and in the New Testament, and today Silwān in Arabic[218]. *(m'yn my) npṭw ḥ* "(spring of the waters of) Nephtoaḥ" (Jos 15:9) located on the outskirts of Jerusalem is called today Lifta[219]. *gb'wn* "Gibeon" (e.g. Jos 11:19), north of Jerusalem is present-day "al-Jib"[220]. *byt ḥwrwn 'lywn* "Upper Beth-Ḥoron" (Jos 10:10) and *byt ḥwrwn tḥtwn* "Lower Beth-Ḥoron (Jos 16:3) on the road to Jerusalem are today "Bēt 'Ūr Fauqa" and "Bēt 'Ūr Taḥta"[221]. If, for example, the ' was lost in *n'ym* "Nain," it should be born in mind that it served as a provincial center in the Byzantine Period[222]. The conclusion is that the cultured city Jerusalem influenced its environs[223]. It is true, that to prove this theory conclusively the whole set of place names in Palestine must be systematically investigated. If it is then found that, in general, the relationship is different, only then will it be possible to rely on the material which I have gathered.

As was shown above, after the first stage of the linguistic change had occurred, i.e. *ḥ* > ', the gutturals were completely lost in SA[224]. Therefore, it is not surprising that ancient *š'lbym* (e.g. Judg 1:35) is today Selbit in Arabic without '[225]. The excavations carried out there by Sukenik revealed the remains of a Samaritan synagogue and fragments of a Samaritan inscription[226]. There is no information on Samaritans in *mwdy'yn*, modern Midye, located on the Beth Horon — Jerusalem road, and therefore, nothing can be said about it. But if we find today "'Amwas" deriving from *ḥmh* + a Greek case ending, might this not show the first Samaritan stage *ḥ* > ' ? Not only do we know of Samaritans in this area in the

218 G. Dalman, *Jerusalem und sein Gelände*, p. 50.

219 *Ibid.*, p. 57; Abel, *GP*, II, p. 398.

220 *GP*, II, p. 335.

221 *Ibid.*, pp. 274, 275.

222 Another explanation is also quite possible: Foreign elements in the city and its environs after the destruction of the Second Temple. See: M. Avi-Yonah, *Bime Roma u-Bizantiyon* (In the Days of Rome and Byzantium), Jerusalem 1962, p. 244, n. 3, and the literature quoted there from Eusebius (Oral communication of Dr. M. Avi-Yonah). The spelling *Σιλωάμ* is already found in the Second Temple Period, and it is difficult to explain the *μ* if the *ḥ* was still pronounced. See my book (*op. cit.*, p. 68, n. 115), p. 39.

223 Avi-Yonah, *GHEY*, p. 137. Is it a coincidence that Eusebius mentions *'yn dwr* — in which the ' was also lost — in his Onomasticon (ed. Melamed, p. 46, no. 475) together with *n'ym–nyyn* and *byt š'n*? This city was in the Beisan district (Avi-Yonah, *loc. cit.*).

224 It may be assumed that in the isolated villages the original state of affairs remained.

225 Abel, *GP*, II, p. 438.

226 *Bulletin of the Museum of Jewish Antiquities*, I, p. 26 ff.

Byzantine Period[227], but in the Palestinian Talmud they are mentioned as being in *mdyyh*. This may indicate that all (or most) of its inhabitants were Samaritans[228]. Nevertheless, we cannot come to a definite conclusion until we have systematically investigated the forms of all the place names in all the above-mentioned areas in all periods (including the Medieval Period, both in Arabic and in transcriptions).

In any event, the name " 'Amwas" requires further attention. In the Rabbinic sources there are at least seven place names which go back to a root *ḥmm*[229]. All of these names have preserved the guttural to this day. In four instances — 1. near Tiberias; 2. modern el-Ḥammeh; 3. opposite Jericho; 4. *ḥmt'* of Pella — the original *ḥ* has remained. In two instances — 1. Hamath, north of the river Yabbok in Transjordan (Talmudic "Arabia"; cf. *supra*, p. 71); 2. apparently in a Samaritan district — *ḥ* > '. It is therefore characteristic that in Rabbinic sources these names appear in various forms. Completely Hellenized forms *'mtn* and *m'ws* — *'m'ws* are found[230]. A partially Hellenized form is *'m'ws* — *m'ws*. (Metathesis apparently took place here [= *'m'ws*!].) *'mhws*[231], a Babylonian Aramaic form is found in a "Babylonian" source. This shows — as we have seen before — that the original consonant was *ḥ*. Whereas the form *'m'ws* shows the first stage of the linguistic change (*ḥ* > ') which has been preserved until the present-day — there seems to be a partially Hellenized form grafted onto the original form. In this manner, I explain the form occurring in the second el-Ḥammeh inscription[232]: *wdkyr lṭb ywdn 'rdh mn ḥym'ys* (read: *ḥym'ws*) "May Judan from *Himaos* be remembered for good." The form *ḥym'ws* = *ḥmh* + the Greek case ending[233], i.e. he was from that very same place. He is mentioned in this manner since the other donors listed in the inscription were

227 *SY*, p. 6. 228 *Loc. cit.* and note.

229 See especially: *SY*, p. 44 ff.; B. Maisler (Mazar), *Tarbiz*, XVIII (1948), pp. 62–63, *contra SY*, pp. 6, 7, 48. See also Klein, *MS*, pp. 42–43. Klein, *ibid.*, does not identify *ḥmt' dpḥl*. This place is not even given a separate entry in *SY*, but is mentioned (without identification) on p. 25, *s.v. dm'*, no. 2. For the identification, see: I. Press, *A Topographical Encyclopaedia of Palestine*, II, Jerusalem 1951, pp. 264–265 (Hebrew): Two kilometers north of Khirbet Faḥl. Cf. also *ZDPV*, LVIII (1931), pp. 26, 28.

230 This is the most common form. See: *SY*, p. 5, n. 1. Klein, *MS*, p. 43, lists also the form *'m'ws*, but this form is not listed in *SY*. What is its origin (= *'amwas*!)?

231 *SY*, p. 5, col. b, bot. (correction).

232 *Ibid.*, p. 46, cols. a–b.

233 The *y* represents approximately the sound [ɛ]; cf. *'Εμαοῦς* = *'m'ws*. In contemporary texts, [a], especially in a doubly closed syllable, became [ɛ], e.g. *'ɛbbd* "father." See: H.L. Ginsberg, *Tarbiz*, V (1934), p. 381. This explains forms such as

from other places: Sepphoris, Kefar Aqabiah, Capernaum, Arbel, and Susita. We have here the place name *ḥym'ws* "Ama'us" (= 'Ama'us). It is interesting to note that although completely Hellenized forms occur in Rabbinic sources[234], the places called *ḥmh* were preserved by the Arabs either in their pure Semitic form, in the form after the first linguistic change (*ḥ* > '), or in a partially Hellenized form, i.e. " 'Amwas," with the root in the form after the first (Samaritan?) linguistic change + the Greek ending. It is interesting to note that the last two places are written in Rabbinic sources also with ' (and of course, with *ḥ*), but the others not!

With regard to the last form, why was the Greek language unable to completely Hellenize the form so that the ' has remained to this day? The answer to this seems to be as follows: The partially Hellenized form was replaced in the third century C.E.[235] by a different name: *Νικόπολις*! The ruling class therefore did not continue to employ the previous name, and the desire to imitate ended as a matter of course. (It is possible that because *'kw* "Acre" and other cities spelled with gutturals received Greek names their original Semitic names were preserved alongside. This was not the case, for example, with regard to *n'ym — nyyn*[236].)

All these names show clearly that in spite of the power of Greek influence, the inhabitants in the vicinity of the Hellenized cities succeeded more or less in preserving their language and their place names as received from their ancestors[237]. When the Byzantine Empire was conquered by the Arabs, the Greek names were for the most part quickly

sygyn "much" (= *sgy* + *-n*) *BR*, Ms. V, pp. 624, 707, 931. Cf. also: *'ytryn* (= *'tryn*) "places" 699; *mytlyn* (= *mtlyn*) "parables" 924; etc.

234 Also in the Jaffa Inscription: *l'zr bn yhwšw m'm'ws* "Leazar b. Joshua from Amaus." (*SY*, p. 80, col. a, no. 5). But in CPA we find *'m'ws* and even *'mw's*, the present-day form. See Schulthess, *LS*, p. 148.

235 Abel, *GP*, II, p. 314.

236 This hypothesis could be investigated in one branch of the Semitic Languages: In the area where Amharic speakers — who do not pronounce the gutturals — rule over Tigriña speakers — who are able to pronounce them. Unfortunately, I am unable to clarify the matter.

237 The name *ḥmh* and related forms exemplifies the need for cooperation between linguists and scholars dealing in the geographical history of Palestine. A serious beginning cannot be made until there exists a geographical-historical dictionary in which the forms of each name are listed from antiquity until the present-day from every language, writer, and period. Even Klein, *ibid.*, in dealing with the various forms of the name *ḥmh* attributed them to some extent (in a different manner than that presented here) to Greek influence.

forgotten: The Greek Scythopolis — approximately 1000 years old — became once again Beisan; Ptolemais was lost and the ancient name Akko was revived. The reason for this phenomenon is that the peasants — who were close to the Arab conquerors in origin, language, custom, and way of life — assimilated to them over a period of hundreds of years until they became one people — the Arabs of Palestine. We may assume that popular elements such as these were also to be found in the cities. (The population of the cities derives from the villages.) Among those in the cultured class, the scribal families — from which preachers, teachers, and Masoretes came — for religio-nationalistic reasons could not completely go over to Greek culture as did the rest of the Jewish intelligentia — and probably even more so the Gentile intelligentia. Even if the correct pronunciation was not preserved among them they could easily restore it from their neighbors in the villages. They were even able to attract villagers to their ranks as is evidenced by the names "So-and-so from such-and-such a village." With the decline of Greek culture and the rise of Arabic culture with its Semitic pronunciation, the Semitic pronunciation of Aramaic was able to recapture its place also among the Jewish class (or in the Jewish places) were it had been forgotten. This took place thanks to the Arabic background. This is in contrast to the Samaritans among whom apparently no one who had preserved the ancient pronunciation tradition — in any case not among the intelligentia — had survived until the period of the Arabic conquest. Thus their ability to pronounce the gutturals was completely lost, just as their use of Aramaic as their vernacular disappeared, even though geographically they remained in the same area and were not dispersed outside of Palestine.